Comprehensive Approach Toolkit: Training Needs Analysis

by:

Emily-Ana Filardo, Michael H. Thomson, Alisha Harkness, Barbara D. Adams

Human*Systems*® Incorporated
111 Farquhar Street
Guelph, ON N1H 3N4

Project Manager:

Michael H. Thomson
(519) 836-5911 ext. 301

On Behalf of

Department of National Defence

As represented by

Defence Research and Development Canada Toronto
1133 Sheppard Avenue West
North York, ON, M3K 2C9

Project Scientific:

Dr. Tara Holton
(416) 635-2101

March 2013

Author

....

Michael H. Thomson
Human*systems*® Incorporated

Approved by

....

Dr. Tara Holton
Scientific Authority

Abstract

This research was conducted in support of a Defence Research and Development Canada -Toronto (DRDC Toronto) applied research project (ARP) aimed at developing a Canadian Forces (CF) training toolkit for personnel deploying to operations that adopt the Comprehensive Approach (CA). The CA to operations has been described as the "ability to bring to bear all instruments of national and coalition power and influence upon a problem in a timely, coordinated fashion (i.e., diplomatic, economic, military, and informational)" (Leslie, Gizewski, & Rostek, 2009, p. 11). This means that effective utilization of the CA requires collaboration between civilian and military assets. However, due to organizational differences in goals, culture, motivation, and so on, this collaboration has been challenging in the past (e.g., Holton, Febbraro, Filardo, Barnes, Fraser, & Spiece, 2011; Thomson, Adams, Filardo, Flear, & DeWit, 2013; Thomson, Adams, Hall, Brown, & Flear, 2011). This suggests that effective CF engagement using the CA may require additional training and resources.

The current study was aimed at assessing the current state of CF training and education for the CA, identifying the needs and gaps, in an effort to develop a CA training toolkit. To this end, a survey was conducted of existing tools available, amongst our allies and within the commercial environment, to train the CA within the CF. Discussions were conducted with subject-matter experts (SMEs) that identified issues to be considered in developing the toolkit, and focus-group discussions helped clarify the issues and suggested elements to include when training the CA. Results showed that a) there is a need to better understand CA counterparts, especially other government departments (OGDs); b) training needs to involve CA counterparts to increase its theoretical and operational relevance; c) there is a greater need for relationship building with CA counterparts through face-to-face interactions; d) CA training should include communication and relationship building skill development; e) CA training should include more extensive cultural awareness training that also encompasses organizational culture awareness; f) training needs to consider the type of operation, the goals of the mission, and a person's role within a mission; and g) training needs to be cost-effective and must fit into the current training curriculum as training schedules are currently overloaded. Based on the SME and focus group discussions, recommendations are made for elements that might be included in the CA toolkit in a graduated plan for training and education.

Résume

La présente recherche a été réalisée en soutien à un projet de recherche appliquée (PRA) de Recherche et développement pour la défense Canada – Toronto visant à élaborer une boîte à outils des Forces canadiennes à l'intention du personnel déployé à des opérations qui adoptent l'approche exhaustive (AE). Dans le cadre des opérations, cette approche a été décrite comme la « capacité d'exploiter toutes les sources de puissance et d'influence (diplomatiques, économiques, militaires, informationnelles, etc.) nationales et coalisées pour régler un problème d'une manière efficace et coordonnée » (Leslie, Gizewski, & Rostek, 2009, p. 11). Cela signifie que le recours efficace à l'AE repose sur la collaboration entre les ressources civiles et militaires. Cependant, en raison des différences organisationnelles en matière d'objectifs, de culture, de motivation, etc., cette collaboration a été ébranlée par le passé (p. ex. Holton, Febbraro, Filardo, Barnes, Fraser, & Spiece, 2011; Thomson, Adams, Filardo, Flear, & DeWit, 2013; Thomson, Adams, Hall, Brown, & Flear, 2011). Cela suggère que l'engagement efficace des FC dans l'utilisation de l'AE peut nécessiter de la formation et des ressources supplémentaires.

La présente étude visait à évaluer l'état actuel de la formation et de l'entraînement des FC pour l'AE, à déterminer les besoins et les lacunes, afin d'élaborer une boîte à outils en matière d'AE. À cette fin, une étude des outils existants disponibles a été réalisée chez nos alliés et dans le milieu commercial, pour enseigner l'AE au sein des FC. Des discussions se sont déroulées auprès d'experts en la matière (EM) qui ont cerné des difficultés dont il faut tenir compte dans l'élaboration de la boîte à outils, et des discussions avec des groupes témoins ont aidé à clarifier les enjeux et permis de suggérer des éléments à inclure au moment de la formation en matière d'AE. Les résultats ont montré a)qu'il importe de mieux comprendre les homologues de l'AE, en particulier les autres ministères; b) les besoins en matière de formation pour impliquer les homologues en matière d'AE dans le but d'augmenter sa pertinence théorique et opérationnelle; c) qu'il faut absolument construire une relation avec les homologues en matière d'AE par des interactions en personne; d) que la formation en matière d'AE devrait comprendre le perfectionnement des compétences en communication et en construction de relations; e) qu'elle devrait aussi comprendre une formation plus intensive sur la sensibilisation à la culture qui comprend aussi la sensibilisation à la culture organisationnelle; f) que la formation doit tenir compte du type d'opération, des objectifs de la mission, et du rôle de la personne au sein d'une mission, et g) que la formation doit être rentable et s'inscrire dans le programme de formation actuel étant donné que les horaires de formation débordent déjà. D'après les discussions avec les EM et les groupes témoins, on a recommandé d'inclure des éléments dans la boîte à outils de l'AE selon un plan gradué de formation et d'instruction.

Executive Summary

Comprehensive Approach Toolkit: Training Needs Analysis

Emily-Ana Filardo, Michael H. Thomson, Alisha Harkness, Barbara D. Adams, Human*systems*® Incorporated; DRDC Toronto CR2013-xxx; Defence R&D Canada – Toronto; March 2013.

This research was conducted in support of a Defence Research and Development Canada - Toronto (DRDC Toronto) applied research project (ARP) entitled "Training Toolkit for the Comprehensive Approach." The CA to operations has been described as the "ability to bring to bear all instruments of national and coalition power and influence upon a problem in a timely, coordinated fashion (i.e., diplomatic, economic, military, and informational)" (Leslie, Gizewski, & Rostek, 2009, p. 11). This means that effective utilization of the CA to operations requires collaboration between civilian and military assets. However, due to organizational differences in goals, culture, motivation, and so on, this collaboration has been challenging in the past (Holton, Febbraro, Filardo, Barnes, Fraser, & Spiece, 2011; Thomson, Adams, Filardo, Flear, & DeWit, 2013; Thomson, Adams, Hall, Brown, & Flear, 2011; Thomson, Adams, Hall, & Flear, 2010). One way to alleviate these challenges may be to develop training and education across these organizations to prepare individuals to work more effectively in a CA environment. Previous research (see Thomson et al., 2010; Thomson et al., 2011) also indicates that training for the CA was deficient for the mission in Afghanistan.

The present study was aimed at assessing the current state of CF training and education for the CA, identifying needs and gaps to be addressed through the development of a CA training toolkit. To this end, a survey was conducted of existing tools, amongst our allies and within the commercial environment, that train elements of the CA within the CF.. These tools were then assessed against a series of evaluation criteria to gauge how well they might potentially meet the needs of the CF in training the CA. Subsequently, military and civilian subject-matter experts (SMEs) were interviewed about the current state of CA training within the CF and were asked to identify issues to be considered in developing a CA training toolkit. Two focus groups were then conducted with military personnel to clarify the issues raised by SME interviews and to suggest elements that might be included in a CA toolkit.

The evaluations of the available CF courses and training tools (i.e., from our allies or that were commercially available) found no single tool that was fully sufficient for training the CA. The courses available through the various CF institutions are aimed at promoting better collaboration and communication; however, the scope and accessibility of these courses is not broad enough to fully prepare CF personnel to be comprehensive in the operational environment. The tools available were seen as generally too specific to be effectively applied to CA training. In general, these tools focused on one or two aspects of the CA, but did not cover the wider range of skills (such as relationship building, communication skills, negotiation skills, etc.) required in order to be effective in a CA environment.

SME and focus group discussions indicated a need to maintain and expand the CA knowledge that had been developed in the course of recent operations to ensure that they would be available for future operations. Further, core competencies and skills for effective CA operators such as relationship building, communication, openmindedness, and flexibility/adaptability were highlighted. The main needs that were emphasized by SMEs and focus group participants were the following:

a) there is a need to better understand CA counterparts, especially other government departments (OGDs);
b) training needs to involve CA counterparts to increase its theoretical and operational relevance;
c) there is a greater need for relationship building with CA counterparts through face-to-face interactions;
d) CA training should include communication and relationship building skill development;
e) CA training should include cultural awareness training that also encompasses organizational culture awareness;
f) training needs to consider the type of operation, the goals of the mission, and a person's role within a mission; and
g) training needs to be cost-effective and should fit into the current training curriculum as training schedules are currently overloaded.

Based on the SME and focus group discussions, recommendations were made for how core competencies and skills might be developed for CF members to work effectively in a CA environment. As well, suggestions were made to address core needs through a graduated plan for training and education.

Sommaire

Comprehensive Approach Toolkit: Training Needs Analysis

Emily-Ana Filardo, Michael H. Thomson, Alisha Harkness, Barbara D. Adams, Human*systems*® Incorporated; DRDC Toronto CR2013-xxx; Defence R&D Canada – Toronto; March 2013.

La présente recherche a été réalisée en appui à un projet de recherche appliquée de Recherche et développement pour la défense Canada (RDDC Toronto) intitulé « Boîte à outils de formation pour l'approche exhaustive ». L'AE aux opérations a été décrite comme «la capacité d'exploiter toutes les sources de puissance et d'influence (diplomatiques, économiques, militaires, informationnelles, etc.) nationales et coalisées pour régler un problème d'une manière efficace et coordonnée » (Leslie, Gizewski, & Rostek, 2009, p. 11). Cela signifie que le recours efficace à l'AE nécessite la collaboration entre les ressources civiles et militaires. Cependant, en raison des différences organisationnelles en matière d'objectifs, de culture, de motivation, etc., cette collaboration a été ébranlée par le passé (p. ex. Holton, Febbraro, Filardo, Barnes, Fraser, & Spiece, 2011; Thomson, Adams, Filardo, Flear, & DeWit, 2013; Thomson, Adams, Hall, Brown, & Flear, 2010). Une façon de pallier ces défis pourrait être d'élaborer de la formation et de l'instruction au sein de ces organisations pour préparer les personnes à travailler de façon plus efficace dans un environnement d'AE. La recherche antérieure (voir Thomson et al, 2010; Thomson et al, 2011) indique aussi que la formation pour l'AE avait été déficiente pour la mission en Afghanistan.

La présente étude visait à évaluer l'état actuel de la formation et de l'instruction en matière d'AE au sein des FC, de déterminer les besoins et les lacunes à combler par l'élaboration d'une boîte à outils pour la formation en matière d'AE. À cette fin, une étude des outils existants disponibles qui servent à enseigner des éléments de l'AE au sein des FC, a été réalisée chez nos alliés et dans le milieu commercial. Ils ont été évalués par rapport à des critères d'évaluation pour mesurer comment ils répondraient potentiellement aux besoins des FC pour l'instruction en matière d'AE. Par la suite, des entrevues ont été réalisées avec des experts en la matière militaires et civils sur l'état actuel de l'instruction en matière d'AE au sein des FC et on leur a également demandé de déterminer les enjeux dont il faut tenir compte au moment d'élaborer la boîte à outils pour l'instruction en matière d'AE. Deux groupes témoins ont par la suite été mis sur pied avec du personnel militaire pour clarifier les enjeux soulevés au cours des entrevues avec les EM et pour suggérer les éléments qui pourraient faire partie d'une boîte à outils pour l'AE.

Les évaluations des cours et des outils de formation disponibles au sein des FC (c.-à-d. auprès de nos alliés ou dans le commerce) ont permis de constater qu'il n'existait aucun outil entièrement suffisant pour offrir l'instruction en matière d'AE. Les cours disponibles dans les différentes institutions des FC visaient à promouvoir une meilleure collaboration et une meilleure communication; cependant, la portée et l'accessibilité de ces cours ne sont pas assez vastes pour préparer globalement le personnel des Forces à être exhaustif dans l'environnement opérationnel. Les outils disponibles étaient jugés généralement trop spécifiques pour être appliqués de façon efficace à l'instruction en matière d'AE. En général, ces outils mettaient surtout l'accent sur un ou deux aspects de l'AE, mais ne couvraient pas un éventail plus large de compétences (comme la construction de relations, les compétences en

communication, en négociation, etc.) nécessaire afin d'être efficace dans un environnement d'AE. Les discussions avec les EM et les groupes témoins ont mis en lumière la nécessité de maintenir et d'étendre la connaissance en matière d'AE qui avait été élaboré dans le cours des opérations récentes afin d'assurer qu'elles seraient disponibles pour les opérations à venir. Par ailleurs, on a également souligné des compétences et des capacités de base pour la pratique efficace de l'AE telle que la construction de relations, la communication, l'ouverture d'esprit et la souplesse/l'adaptabilité. Les besoins principaux suivants ont été soulignés par les EM et les participants aux groupes témoins :

a) Nécessité de mieux comprendre les homologues de l'AE, spécialement les autres ministères;

b) Les besoins d'instruction pour impliquer les homologues de l'AE pour augmenter sa pertinence théorique et opérationnelle;

c) Il y a un plus grand besoin pour la construction de relations avec les homologues de l'AE par l'entremise d'interactions en personne;

d) L'instruction en matière d'AE devrait comprendre le perfectionnement des compétences en matière de communication et de construction de relations;

e) L'instruction en matière d'AE devrait comprendre de l'instruction sur la sensibilisation à la culture qui comprend aussi la sensibilisation à la culture organisationnelle;

f) La formation doit tenir compte du genre d'opération, des objectifs de la mission et du rôle d'une personne au sein d'une mission;

g) La formation doit être rentable et doit s'inscrire dans le programme de formation actuel, car les horaires de formation débordent déjà.

À la lumière des discussions avec les EM et les groupes témoins, des recommandations ont été formulées sur la façon dont les compétences et les capacités de base devraient être perfectionnées pour que les membres des FC travaillent de façon efficace dans un environnement d'AE. De plus, des suggestions ont été faites pour traiter les besoins de base par l'entremise d'un plan gradué pour la formation et l'instruction.

Table of Contents

This page intentionally left blank.

List of Tables

List of Figures

This page intentionally left blank.

1.   Project Overview

Today, Canadian Forces (CF) operate in a security environment shaped by failed and failing states, which serve as breeding grounds for civil unrest and safe havens for adversaries, as well as diverse foes, such as terrorist organizations, warlords, and trans-national criminal organizations (Leslie, Gizewski, & Rostek, 2009). To compound the problem, the CF often operates in densely populated urban centres, where they are required to navigate a diverse human terrain. This means essentially determining friend from foe while at the same time managing their legitimacy as an "occupying" force in the eyes of the local population.

More than ever before, military campaigns include stabilization and development elements. So while the military engages in combat operations, it also simultaneously supports stabilization and development initiatives in a number of ways. Referred to as the Comprehensive Approach (CA) to operations, it is defined by the Canadian Forces Joint Publication-CFJP 3.0, Operations as:

> …the application of commonly understood principles and collaborative processes that enhance the likelihood of favourable and enduring outcomes within a particular situation. The Comprehensive Approach brings together all the elements of power and other agencies needed to create enduring solutions to a campaign. These may include: military (joint and multinational forces), Canadian government departments and agencies (whole of government), foreign governments and international organizations (e.g., NATO and UN) and publicly funded organizations (e.g., NGOs) (2011, p. GL-3).

Leslie and colleagues have argued that utilization of the CA has become "increasingly essential to achieving effective results" (Leslie et al., 2009, p. 11). A force that adopts the CA "would employ diplomatic, defence, development, and commercial resources, aligned with those of numerous other agencies, coordinated through an integrated campaign plan, and then applied in areas of operations as needed," producing ultimately "greater mission effectiveness" (Leslie et al., 2009, p. 11). Switching between war fighting, reconstruction, and stabilization, CF personnel must be able to transition to these various roles. And this means that "troops must be capable of conducting a variety of operations simultaneously, and often, as part of broader, integrated teams" (Leslie et al., 2009, p. 13).

A number of questions emerge when considering operating in a CA. First, if CF personnel will be required to operate in missions that consist of both traditional and non-traditional military activities as well as participate in teams that include military and non-military personnel, then what skills and competencies will they need? Moreover, how are these skills currently acquired in CF training and education, and what could be improved? Finally, who needs these skills – everyone in the CF or just select individuals?

Past research has pointed to a number of skills and competencies that are important to successful implementation of the CA in operations. For example, research by Brown and Adams (2011) identified individual characteristics (such as openmindedness and agreeableness), motivation, professionalism, problem solving skills, thinking skills (such as flexibility and adaptability), and social skills (such as relationship building) as important skills for operating in a collaborative environment. Research by Holton et al. (2011) pointed to the need for trust building, organizational awareness, and cultural competence. Finally, Thomson, Adams, Hall, Flear, and Brown (2011) also found that negotiation skills were important for successful operations within a collaborative context.

A number of approaches to training elements important for the CA have been implemented within the CF, such as collaboration training, intercultural competency training, and civil-military training. However, it is unclear how effective these approaches have been for developing effective CA operators and whether this training has been made available to the right people at the right time.

To answer these and other questions, Defence Research and Development Canada - Toronto (DRDC Toronto) is currently conducting an applied research project (ARP) aimed at identifying and assessing a range of intercultural competency and collaboration training tools and methodologies in order to develop a training toolkit for the CA to operations. As such, the present study was conducted to provide an understanding of the current status of CA training and education within the CF as well as to investigate tools available through Canada's allies and industry that are aimed at training aspects of the CA. This study was also designed to assess the CA training needs within the CF through discussions with subject-matter experts (SMEs) and focus groups – that is, with the people who work within CA themselves.

2. Existing Comprehensive Approach Training Tools

2.1 Tool Search

To begin, a keyword list was generated. This process involved the brainstorming amongst all members of the research team and relied on their cumulative knowledge and experience with the pertinent scientific, psychological, and military domains. The keywords were developed to focus the tool search. The team established a number of core concepts, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Keywords searched

Core Concept	Keywords:	Additional Variants
Comprehensive Approach	Comprehensive approach training military Comprehensive approach training tools Canadian Forces Comprehensive approach tool Comprehensive approach capability Integrated approach training military Whole of Government JIMP	
Culture	Cultur* training Cultural competenc* training Cultural knowledge training Culture and language training Intercultural competence training Inter-organizational culture training Expatriate (ex pat) and cultural training	Military, army
Collaboration	Collaboration training Collaborative planning training Collaborative leadership training Interagency collaboration	Military
Negotiation	Negotiation training	Military
Communication	Communication skills training	Military
Training	Scenario, vignettes, simulation, modules, lectures, presentations, discussions, consultation	
Competence scales/training	Cross-cultural competence Cultural awareness Cultural intelligence (CQ) Social skills Leadership training	
Interpersonal relationship building	Interpersonal, relationship, building, training, strategy, cooperation	
Communication skills	Communication, skill, information sharing, training, strategy, influence	

After establishing the core concepts, primary keywords were then developed. Using these keywords and core concepts, a web search was conducted using Google. Each keyword combination search produced thousands of results. A minimum of the first 25 results for each search were scrutinized. First, we read the title and brief preview of each search result. If the title and description seemed potentially relevant and unique (i.e., not one we had already investigated), we followed the link on the Google search to the result's website. The website was then thoroughly investigated for any tools or courses that could potentially be relevant for CA training. Any potential tools identified were added to a master list of tools spreadsheet. In addition to the web search procedure, some potential tools were identified in SME discussions that took place as part of this project. In total, 53 commercially available training tools were identified.

As constraints within the project made it unreasonable to assess all 53 tools, a subset of the 53 tools was selected. A list of inclusion criteria was created to promote a thorough understanding of the nature of each tool to help guide decisions and to help guide the choice of which tools to evaluate. The evaluation criteria for the tools were developed in collaboration with the researchers at DRDC Toronto. The inclusion criteria used were as follows:

- Information needed to be available either through the tool's website or via contact with an individual from the organization providing the tool.
- The tool needed to be applicable or adaptable to a military environment.
- Priority was given to tools/programs that were designed for or by the military.
- The tool needed to be designed to be used across multiple cultural environments.
- There needed to be a unique aspect of the tool that was not covered by other tools already assessed.

Based on these criteria, 24 of 53 tools were selected for evaluation.

2.1.1 CF Courses, Workshops, and Exercises

Prior to the evaluation of the tools identified through the online search, a list of courses, workshops, and exercises provided by the various CF institutions that were relevant to the comprehensive approach were identified, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Courses available through the CF

Course	Description
Royal Military College (RMC)	
Comprehensive Operations	This course examines interagency operations in the operational environment. Students learn how factors such as means and ends, conflict theories, concepts, and doctrine influence strategic objectives.
Canada in the Global Strategic Environment	This course examines Canada's role in an international, political, strategic and economic setting. Students learn about international and inter-state relations, the role of non-governmental organizations (NGO) and other government departments (OGDs), and religious movements, as well as the constraints on using military power.
National Security, International Affairs & Defence Management Studies	This course examines the impact that domestic and international decisions have at the strategic level. Students learn about Canada's cooperation with international allies, international organizations, and other regions.

Course	Description
The Role of Culture in Whole-of-Government Approaches	This course, designed for both military and civilian senior decision makers, studies the role of culture in Whole-of-Government (WoG) approaches at the strategic and operational levels. It focuses on the anthropological, sociological, and psychological understandings of cultural realities; culture and inter-agency collaboration; and dealing with organizational and ethnic cultural otherness.
Advanced Joint Operational Planning	This course develops the advanced knowledge and skills for planning and conduct of joint and combined operations across the spectrum of conflict at the operational level.
Canadian Forces College (CFC)	
Canadian Security Studies Programme	This course is offered to select Colonels, Naval Captains, Department of National Defence civilian members, OGDs, police and emergency services, military allies, and those in the defence industry. This course emphasizes the strategy of Canadian security considering the WoG approach to CF operations.
National Security Programme	This course is offered to select Colonels, Naval Captains, General/Flag Officers, DND civilian members, OGDs, police, NGOs, and military allies. This programme prepares students to lead and manage at the strategic level with additional training for military officers to be joint task force commanders at the operational level.
Joint Command and Staff Programme	The aim of this course is to prepare selected senior officers of the Defence Team for command and staff appointments in the contemporary operating environment across the continuum of operations in national and international settings.
Joint Staff Operations Programme	This programme is designed for Captains, Naval Lieutenants, Majors, and Lieutenant-Commanders who are, or will be, employed for the first time at operational- or strategic-level headquarters. This course provides education and training for joint operations. The objective of this programme is for junior officers to obtain the necessary skills and knowledge to operate at a joint headquarters.
Peace Support Training Centre (PSTC)	
CIMIC Operator	The aim of this training course is to enable CF personnel to perform the duties of Civil-Military Cooperation (CIMIC) operator in all types of operations. This could mean as a member of a CIMIC contingent or as individuals deployed within the air or maritime environment.
CIMIC Staff Officer	The aim of this training course is to enable CF personnel to perform the duties of a CIMIC staff officer at the tactical and operational level. This involves planning and directing of CIMIC activities and the provision of CIMIC input to the Operational Planning Process (OPP). This could mean as a member of a CIMIC contingent or as individuals deployed within the air or maritime environment.
Land Force Command and Staff College (LFCSC)	
Army Operations Course	The AOC is designed to prepare Army Junior Officers to conduct the duties of key staff positions at the unit/battle group and brigade group levels. Some activities include battle group planning and the implementation of the OPP at the formation level within a joint environment.

In addition to the courses offered through the CF, the Pearson Centre (formerly the Pearson Peacekeeping Centre) offers training exercises and scenario simulations that are meant to build knowledge, skills and abilities in a joint operational environment (Pearson Centre, 2013). For example, the Salmo training scenario was developed to feature:

- Asymmetrical conflict between state and non-state agents
- The influence of culture, tradition, and history
- Economic drivers of conflict
- Full spectrum of actions with multiple players
- Whole-of-coalition concept
- Cross-cutting issues (Sexual and Gender-Based Violence, HIV/AIDS, etc.)
- Ever watchful and critical media, in-theatre and at home
- Non-violent conflict as an end-state

These courses and scenarios are utilized by both military and non-military organizations both within and outside of Canada.

The various civil-military and civil-military relations seminars organized by the CF are aimed at developing a mutual understanding between the CF and OGD/NGO/international organization (IO) members. These seminars have generally been well received by the participants and work to develop joint training, increase knowledge, and expand personal relations between these organizations (Thompson, Febbraro, & Holton, 2012).

Joint training exercises conducted by the CF such as Exercise Maple Guardian and Exercise Maple Resolve are large-scale high-readiness training exercises that incorporate elements of CA training. Exercises are staged in environments that are designed to mimic operational environments such as Afghanistan and include staged villages that incorporate actors playing the role of the host nation population. OGD members are invited to participate in these exercises in order to increase the operational relevance of the exercises.

2.1.2 Instructor-Led Training[1]

This section evaluates training that is conducted in an instructor-led environment either through long-distance courses that involve online participation, hybrid courses that involve some element of face-to-face and online participation, or in-person courses that involve face-to-face participation.

2.1.2.1 Integrative Peacebuilding Program

The Integrative Peacebuilding Program, offered through St. Paul University in Ottawa starting in September 2013, is a course designed for all CA counterparts. It is a hybrid course that incorporates both face-to-face and online material and is designed to engage participants from all CA elements to work together through case studies, problem-solving scenarios, and so on. By engaging all CA collaborators, it allows individuals to build relationships and build a deeper understanding of the other organizations that one might encounter in the CA environment, such as NGOs. Because this course has not yet been offered, it has not yet been evaluated or assessed. Table 3 summarizes the features of this tool.

---

[1] Note that these courses, except where noted, have not been used by the CF and the descriptions of tools and courses are based on descriptions provided by the source/manufacturer, and cannot be fully verified.

Table 3. Integrative Peacebuilding Program

Course Name	Integrative Peacebuilding Program
Distributor	St. Paul University, Graduate program in Conflict Studies
Description	This graduate level professional development program combines face-to-face and distance learning and is designed to provide the necessary skills for soon-to-be deployed government department agency/NGO community personnel on international missions. The five modules in this course cover: • Reflexive Praxis (way of understanding how people deal with problems) • Comprehensive Approach • Complexity Theory (complex adaptive systems) • Religion and Culture (including religious leader engagement) • Identity-based Conflict
Advantages	This program is geared specifically toward working within a CA environment and involves having military, OGDs, and NGOs work together. Joint education allows for mutual understanding and respect. Uses a participatory action research model for learning. Participants work through case studies, problem-solving, etc. in a collaborative manner with individuals from other organizations which can then be applied to situations outside of the classroom environment. Lessons learned and best practices will be developed through participation in the overall program.
Disadvantages	Because this is a course that has been developed for integrative learning (i.e., joint presentations, etc.), it does not seem likely to provide a high level of realism with regard to operational activities. In other words, the types of presentations and activities engaged in during the course are not necessarily the types of activities one would encounter in an operational environment, but are rather developed to create a forced interaction/collaboration amongst the students. The course is provided outside of the CF environment so does not integrate into the current CF curriculum.
Previous evaluations	The first course will begin in September 2013. Therefore, no evaluations of this course have yet been done.
Interface	This is a hybrid of face-to-face and online learning.
Hardware requirements	Because there is an element of online learning, a computer with internet access is required.
Cost to Purchase/Maintain	The cost of the course is unknown at this time.
Remote access	Course is available online; therefore there is remote access to the course.
Fidelity	As the course requires students to work with individuals from different organizations that they might encounter in theatre, there is an element of fidelity. However, this is limited.
Military focus	Course is designed to be appropriate for military, OGD, and NGO personnel.
Dimensions addressed	Collaboration, problem-solving
Languages available	N/A
Culture specific vs. culture general	Culture general
Modifiable?	No
Competency development	Collaboration, understanding, engagement

Course Name	Integrative Peacebuilding Program
Time commitment	5 modules x 6 weeks each
Use by allies	No
Website	None yet.

2.1.2.2 Operational Cultural Training

Operational Cultural Training provided by Communicaid incorporates specific military experience and knowledge in its programs. This helps to ensure that the skills acquired during training programs are applied and useful because it includes scenarios where CF personnel practice engaging in a wide range of situations they will likely encounter when deployed. These scenarios enhance the fidelity of the training programs by allowing CF personnel to consider how to handle a wide range of scenarios without the stress and pressure often present in real-life scenarios.

The language repertoire of this training is extensive with over 76 different languages. Moreover, language training is catered to specific military needs and focuses on topics such as theatre and mission specific terms. Time commitment is around 45 hours which may be too large for the military's already extensive training schedule. However, personalized courses that focus on the specific competencies necessary could be designed in a shorter time frame. Operational cultural training has the potential to be a good fit for the CF. Communicaid has the expertise and flexibility to design a cultural and language program aimed to satisfy the military's unique needs. Table 4 summarizes the features of this tool.

Table 4. Operational Cultural Training

Course Name	Operational Cultural Training
Distributor	Communicaid
Description	Team of over 250 cultural advisors have extensive knowledge of the local culture and equip delegates with the skills and awareness they need to understand the national, regional and even local culture in any current or anticipated Area of Operation. The knowledge that cultural advisors impart to delegates and the skills they help them develop assures that military personnel can more effectively and appropriately respond to any peaceful or conflicting situation, thereby reducing the many risks inherent in the military context.
Advantages	Cultural advisors have an excellent understanding of the military personnel's cultural attitudes and values. Many programs already established for certain places of interest such as Afghanistan. Prepared scenarios have a high degree of mission relevance and realism. Great resources such as military and cultural dictionaries. Ability to conduct training over virtual platforms allowing for the coming together of globally dispersed groups in the same training session. Extensive availability of language training including Arabic and Farsi.
Disadvantages	Seem to have expertise on British information. May lack Canadian expertise. Language courses have a large time commitment and are separate from the cultural and military training.
Previous evaluations	There have not been any previous evaluations.

Course Name	**Operational Cultural Training**
Interface	Face-to-face interactions, Online reading materials, Practical Scenarios.
Hardware requirements	Computers and internet access in some circumstances.
Cost to Purchase/Maintain	Language programs: courses are tailored according to clients' needs and full training fees are provided in a proposal following the diagnostic consultancy process. Individual fees: approximately $65 to $100 per hour per person. Cultural programs: courses are tailored according to clients' needs and full training fees are provided in a proposal following the diagnostic consultancy process. Once base individual fees are established additional delegates can be added for a fixed cost.
Remote access	Some aspects of the course are offered online. Computer with internet access.
Fidelity	Moderate level of fidelity. Scenario-based training mimics real life situations and prepares client for reality.
Military focus	Military focus.
Dimensions addressed	Cultural programs and language programs offered separately.
Languages available	Cadre of 1,400 trainers cover more than 76 languages and are able to support all current and anticipated operations around the world. Ability to deliver capability driven and Mission, Theatre and AO specific language training to all competency levels. World leaders in providing Pashto and Dari language training through extensive team of 25 Afghan nationals and experts in training design.
Culture specific vs. culture general	Both.
Modifiable?	Yes. Value chain allows for diagnosis of the client's needs which is then taken into consideration during program development.
Competency development	Culture specific communication skills, language ability, and increased ability to react thoughtfully to likely situations.
Time commitment	Language courses are designed based on the needs and objectives of the client. Classes are typically divided up into modules of 45 hours. Time commitments for the cultural courses are dependent on the amount of detail the client desires.
Use by allies	Ministry of defense (UK), and royal air force.
Website	http://www.communicaid.com/military-training-solutions/operational-cultural-training.php

2.1.2.3 Cross-Cultural Coaching

Cross-cultural coaching programs offered by Dean Foster Associates include a mobile app for iPhones and Androids in addition to online tutorials, multi-media teaching and live instruction with a culture coach. The Mobile App and online tutorials allow personnel to complete training in small steps at their own convenience. This training focuses on interactions between cultures and does not provide any language training. Therefore, if language training were required then it would be necessary to engage in one contract for culture training and another for language training. This could lead to synchrony issues. There might be unnecessary overlap between courses or gaps in information provided between courses because they are not available from the same organization and, therefore, the curricula are not coordinated. Programs are designed with a business focus. As a result of lack of

experience and despite flexibility in program design, it may be difficult for programs to reflect actual military needs. Table 5 summarizes the features of this tool.

Table 5. Cross-Cultural Coaching

Course Name	Cross-Cultural Coaching
Distributor	Dean Foster Associates
Description	One of the benefits of coaching is its flexibility. In coaching there is no planned agenda, though there can and should be specific objectives. The approach is to respond to the needs of the client as they arise. Also offers pre-planned courses on topics such as "culture compass" and language training called "speaking the language" and "introduction to the language".
Advantages	Already established mobile app for iPhone and Android. Convenient access when on the go. Team coaching is available.
Disadvantages	Business focus.
Previous evaluations	There have not been any previous evaluations of this service.
Interface	Individual training or group training (5-6 people) done via internet, telephone, video, or in person. Mobile App (for iPhone and Android). Options: Classic classroom or webinars.
Hardware requirements	Various depending on the interface. Computers and webcams, possibly.
Cost to Purchase/Maintain	Determined once initial consultation is complete.
Remote access	Yes. Mobile App or Computer with internet connection.
Fidelity	Low. Although Mobile Apps are convenient they do not closely mimic real-life situations.
Military focus	Business foundation, but they claim to be flexible
Dimensions addressed	Culture.
Languages available	None.
Culture specific vs. culture general	Both.
Modifiable?	Yes. Tailor-made.
Competency development	All targeted competencies could be achieved as long as they are identified at the beginning of the coaching and labelled as training objectives.
Time commitment	Initial 1 day meeting followed by half-day sessions every couple months. Total of six sessions for each group.
Use by allies	No.
Website	http://www.deanfosterassociates.com/training/programs.php

2.1.2.4   CultureSmart! Consulting

Culture Smart! Consulting was formed in association with Kuperard. It specializes in providing tailor-made seminars for corporate and public sector organizations dealing with intercultural and diversity issues. Although the CF has not used this service, the UK ministry of defence is a previous client.

Therefore, it is probable that they already possess some knowledge of military needs and roles. Some existing seminar titles include "language and cultural training" and "dealing with diversity." One of the primary objectives of Culture Smart! is to ensure the delivery of a seminar that is designed to meet the specific needs of the client. Consequently, seminars are tailor-made and can be conducted face-to face or in some cases over the internet using Skype. Culture Smart! has developed guide books for over 45 countries. They (one for each country of interest) reveal the human dimension of a country. The books could act as supplementary material in a developed culture training program. Culture Smart! works with a language affiliate that offers language lessons for very few languages (French, Italian, Spanish). The military would likely need to satisfy any necessary language requirements with another contract. Table 6 summarizes the features of this tool.

Table 6. CultureSmart! Consulting

Course Name	CultureSmart! Consulting
Distributor	Kuperard
Description	All courses are personally tailored to identify needs. The clients' needs are assessed through an initial meeting with a detailed proposal based upon specific requirements. Every delegate then receives a pre-seminar questionnaire in order to fine-tune the seminar modules to individual issues. A post-seminar report and delegate evaluation is then delivered. Seminars are held in the clients' chosen location anywhere in the world, as well as at selected seminar facilities. Clients come from the public and private sectors and cover a wide range of industries.
Advantages	Culture guide books are a unique way to provide quick information specific to a country's culture.

The seminars are tailor-made and Culture Smart! has experience working with a military population. |
Disadvantages	Language availability is scarce.
Previous evaluations	There have not been any previous evaluations.
Interface	Seminars are generally provided face-to-face, however, in some cases via Skype/web. According to the clients' needs.
Hardware requirements	Computer/webcam.
Cost to Purchase/Maintain	Programs are not sold as a package. After determining the clients' needs a price is set according to what types of focus they need (i.e., Living & Working Abroad, Working in a Multi-Cultural team, etc.)
Remote access	Seminars may be designed to be accessed with a computer and internet connection.
Fidelity	Depends on how the course is designed.
Military focus	Primarily business but seems flexible.
Dimensions addressed	Culture. Affiliated with a language provider that offers minimal language training.
Languages available	French, Italian, Spanish.
Culture specific vs. culture general	Seminars and lessons with both focuses.
Modifiable?	Tailor-made to clients unique needs.

Course Name	CultureSmart! Consulting
Competency development	Cultural knowledge, professionalism, social skills, motivation.
Time commitment	Tailor-made, variable.
Use by allies	UK Ministry of Defence.
Website	http://www.culturesmartconsulting.com/

2.1.2.5 Cross Cultural Training

Cactus offers an extensive amount of options under their Cross Cultural/ Language Training. There are "general language courses" that focus development of fluency, accuracy, and confidence through grammar, vocabulary and skills work. They also offer "cross cultural training" courses that are designed to provide the necessary skills to live and work across different cultures. In addition, there is a blended learning course that mixes cultural and language learning together. Courses can be completed on a 1:1, group, in-company, online, or on a full immersion basis. There is a heavy focus on language over culture where a typical course consists of 40 hours of language training and 4 hours of cultural training. If the CF wanted to make language a priority over culture (or if they decided on a more extensive culture program elsewhere), then the training offered by Cactus could be a viable option. Table 7 summarizes the features of this tool.

Table 7. Cross-Cultural Coaching

Course Name	Cross Cultural/Language Training
Distributor	Cactus
Description	Cactus offers a wide range of training formats designed to suit the clients' specific requirements. Courses take place in office, home or in one of their training rooms. Lessons take on one format, or combine different formats (such as face-to-face and online) to create more complex, textured language courses. Programs are designed to the needs of participants, and can be run 1:1 or as a small group. They can last from ½ day to 2 days. **Typical modules will include:** • Developing cultural awareness • Dealing with culture shock • Working in a new environment • Different ways of doing business • Cross-cultural team building • Country profiling.
Advantages	Offers blended learning courses where language and cultural training are taught simultaneously, language level tests diagnose current language level. Committed to making the program specific to client needs. Cactus consultants familiarize themselves with the daily activities of their client and tailor their program accordingly. Podcasts and Skype lessons are available.
Disadvantages	For a product called "Cross Cultural Training" there is very little cultural awareness training that takes place. There appears to be a much greater focus on the language component.
Previous evaluations	There do not appear to be any formal evaluations of the program; however, they do list 95 companies that have used the system including UNICEF, London 2012 Olympics, and the Ministry of Defence (likely UK).

Course Name	**Cross Cultural/Language Training**
Interface	Online, podcasts. In-class (travel may be necessary).
Hardware requirements	Internet access, headset, webcam.
Cost to Purchase/Maintain	Varies. General Language Courses: from $55/individual/hour.
Remote access	Flexible. In person and online courses.
Fidelity	Courses include one-on-one language interaction, but a very small cultural component. One of the courses is an immersion course which has a high degree of fidelity. However, the other courses have lower degrees of fidelity because all of the speaking is done with structured exercises.
Military focus	Business.
Dimensions addressed	Language.
Languages available	Extensive list including Arabic, Catalan, Chinese Cantonese, Chinese Mandarin, Czech, Danish, Dutch, English, French, German, Greek, Italian, Japanese, Norwegian, Polish, Portuguese Brazilian, Russian, Turkish and Ukrainian.
Culture specific vs. culture general	General.
Modifiable?	Yes. "Private tuition" courses are tailor-made.
Competency development	Language ability.
Time commitment	40 hours of language training and 4 hours of culture training.
Use by allies	Foreign and commonwealth office: UK and Ministry of Defence.
Website	http://www.cactuslanguagetraining.com/tailormade/us/course-types/category/cultural-training/

2.1.2.6 Corporate Training Materials – Soft Skill Courses

Corporate Training Materials is a division of Global Courseware that offers soft skill training modules. They offer classroom-ready workshop materials that can be used an unlimited amount of times by as many users in the organization as necessary. The materials provide a lesson plan consisting of talking points, activities, and learning modules. A "trainer" at the organization is responsible for learning the lesson plan for the workshop and teaching it to their colleagues.

This set-up has its advantages and drawbacks depending on the situation. First, the military would need to identify an individual with time resources to allocate to learning and teaching the workshop and the ability to do an effective job. If no trainer is chosen, then the tool has no benefit. However, if a good trainer is identified they could use their military expertise to customize the course to be as related to a military context as possible. The workshop lesson plans and resources provide a skeleton structure for what an effective workshop would look like. With some effort, they could be included as part of a broader training program or as a minor refresher training to brush up on important skills pre-deployment. Table 8 summarizes the features of this tool.

Table 8. Corporate Training Materials – Soft Skill Courses

Course Name	Corporate Training Materials – Soft Skill Courses
Distributor	Global Courseware
Description	This company provides customizable training materials for "trainers" of the respective company. The classroom ready workshop materials cover various topics such as communication strategies and interpersonal skills.
Advantages	Small time commitment for entire team (one day at most). Unlimited users in organization. Easily customizable. Case studies and military examples can be incorporated into the existing lesson plans with little effort.
Disadvantages	Require a "trainer" from organization being trained to deliver the course. Business focus. Many of the examples take place in an office environment which could require a great deal of effort to make relevant to the military context. Potentially small impact. The course only lasts one day and the material may lack some connection to the outside world as it takes place in a classroom environment.
Previous evaluations	None.
Interface	Online/in classroom.
Hardware requirements	PowerPoint, projector, printer paper
Cost to Purchase/Maintain	$995/workshop. One-time payment, no renewal fees.
Remote access	None. Training should occur in a classroom setting.
Fidelity	Low. Takes place in a classroom.
Military focus	Business focus.
Dimensions addressed	There are several relevant workshops related to anger management, interpersonal skills, emotional intelligence and problem-solving.
Languages available	N/A
Culture specific vs. culture general	N/A
Modifiable?	Yes. The workshops are basically lesson plans that are taught by a leader who is a member of that organization. Therefore, material could be deleted and added easily.
Competency development	Limited. Classroom simulations are limited in terms of their realism. These training sessions may be effective at teaching learners *about* communication and interpersonal relationship building but may not be as effective at teaching learners *how* to demonstrate those skills.
Time commitment	The actual workshop only lasts a few hours. Preparation time for the teacher could take a few days.
Use by allies	US Army and Navy.
Website	http://corporatetrainingmaterials.com/index.asp

2.1.2.7 Interpersonal Skills Training Centre (ISTC)

The Interpersonal Skills Training Centre works out of Ryerson University. It specializes in experiential learning and offers over 100 live-actor simulations designed to allow learners to practice skills such as group leadership, conflict resolution, counselling and conducting an interview. Highly skilled actors are trained to embody the history, personality, and physical/emotional state of the character/characters of interest. Simulations are designed to re-create actual events that may occur in the learning environment. If the client's needs are not addressed by existing scenarios, custom-built scenarios can be designed. Participants interact with simulators in real-time creating an optimal experimental learning environment that is more realistic than simple role-play or case study assignment. In order to reap any of the benefits, learners must take the situation seriously and feel comfortable with engaging in the simulations. Table 9 summarizes the features of this tool.

Table 9. Interpersonal Skills Training Centre (ISTC)

Course Name	**Interpersonal Skills Training Centre (ISTC)**
Distributor	Ryerson University
Description	The ISTC Simulation Training Program offers over 100 live-actor simulations designed to allow learners to practice skills such as group leadership, conflict resolution, counselling and conducting an interview. Highly skilled actors are trained to embody the history, personality, and physical/emotional state of the character/characters of interest.
Advantages	Effective tool for large and small groups. Simulations closely mimic real-life experience. Small time commitment.
Disadvantages	Military simulation would need to be designed. SME's would need to collaborate with simulation team to ensure an appropriate simulation is designed. This could be heavy on financial and personnel resources. Enthusiastic participation is necessary for the program's effectiveness. If the concept is not taken seriously or if the learners feel uncomfortable, they will not be able to engage and obtain the anticipated benefits.
Previous evaluations	Their work with the Ontario Ministry of Government Services, Centre for Leadership and Learning, OPS Learning & Development, on the design and delivery of "Courageous Conversations in the Workplace: Coaching for Success," is rated by participants according to Ministry standards. Their teams of facilitators and simulators receive consistently high performance and approval ratings (typically 4.5 or higher on a 5.0 point scale) and the course won the 2009 HR Ontario Award of Excellence Dr. Rheta Rosen performed a qualitative study of the ISTC program involving faculty, students and graduates who had used/experienced live-actor simulations. The unpublished report, "An Interpersonal Communication Program as Experiential Learning: A Three Stage Evaluation" found that simulation as an experiential learning modality was highly acclaimed by faculty, students and graduates alike, as a way of engaging students, bringing theory into practice, promoting active learning and as preparation for practicums/placements and future careers.
Interface	Live actors, in person.
Hardware requirements	None.
Cost to Purchase/Maintain	Varies depending on the length and complexity of the scenario, number of characters involved etc.

Course Name	Interpersonal Skills Training Centre (ISTC)
Remote access	Travel costs for actors could be expensive or unlikely. However, they are willing to travel for simulations so the possibility is there.
Fidelity	Good. Live actors train to mimic real-life situations and actual stakeholders.
Military focus	Simulations are custom-built. Therefore military focus is very possible.
Dimensions addressed	Collaboration
Languages available	N/A
Culture specific vs. culture general	N/A
Modifiable?	Extremely. Simulations are custom-made. They begin with an identification of the client's needs and objectives and design the simulation from there.
Competency development	Likely. If simulations are designed to focus on the potential situations the CF will encounter they are the next closest thing to actual experience. The simulations would give the opportunity to consider proper action when outside of the pressures of the actual situation. This practice could help the CF to handle tough situations under pressure.
Time commitment	Limited. A day or so depending on training that takes place outside of the scenario.
Use by allies	No.
Website	http://www.ryerson.ca/istc/learnmore.html

2.1.2.8 Collaborative Leadership Seminar

The Collaborative leadership seminar is offered by the US Office of Personnel Management with the aim to foster competent leaders in all government positions. Learning takes place in a 2-week seminar format with peer-to-peer interactions designed to fine tune leadership strengths and to address unproductive habits. Competencies of interest include interpersonal skills, influencing, and negotiating.

As with many other available tools, this seminar has a strong business focus. The competencies resulting from the seminar could be beneficial to a productive comprehensive approach. For example, difficult conversations are turned into learning conversations where two parties gain a common understanding of each other's needs and wants and a mutual solution is reached. The comprehensive approach relies on communication and cooperation from various actors often across organizations and thus, this seminar could be beneficial for this aim. However, the available overview of the seminar suggests that it may be short on realism and this could hinder experiential learning. The leadership seminar could be a viable tool for a select group of personnel, particularly those in leadership roles. However, it would be the most effective in tandem with another program that is military-specific and realistic. Table 10 summarizes the features of this tool.

Table 10. Collaborative Leadership Seminar

Course Name	Collaborative Leadership Seminar
Distributor	United States Office of Personnel Management
Description	Designed to foster competent leaders in all government positions. Set in the context of peer to peer leadership, this 2-week seminar is designed to enhance leadership skills such as effective communication and interpersonal skills. Learning is applied to real organizational issues where the problem is solved using a collaborative mindset.
Advantages	Related to government environment. Competencies foster cooperation and communication, valuable skills for the comprehensive approach.
Disadvantages	Not military-specific. Lacks fidelity. Learning may not be realistic enough to promote application of knowledge in theatre.
Previous evaluations	No.
Interface	Classroom instructor led learning.
Hardware requirements	None.
Cost to Purchase/Maintain	$5,150 for tuition, materials, meals and lodging.
Remote access	No.
Fidelity	Not particularly. Classroom instructor led learning.
Military focus	Not specifically. Focus is on the government.
Dimensions addressed	Culture, indirectly.
Languages available	N/A.
Culture specific vs. culture general	Culture general.
Modifiable?	No.
Competency development	Interpersonal skills, leveraging diversity, influencing/negotiating, public service motivation
Time commitment	Two weeks
Use by allies	US government
Website	https://www.leadership.opm.gov/Contact/Catalog/Ind_Courses/FY%202013-CLS-508.pdf

2.1.2.9 Cross-Cultural Training (eCrossCulture)

Cross-Cultural Training offered by eCrossCulture is aimed at creating intercultural relationships that are productive and meaningful. They offer various training tools such as workshops on effective nonverbal communication, effective verbal communication skills, perspective taking, building rapport, and emotion regulation. Most of their training tools have been or are in the process of being validated with soldiers. In addition to cross-cultural training, eCrossCulture offers aid and economic

development software. This software allows for rapid identification of the population's needs and assessment of the effects of aid and development projects. Immediate, medium, and long-term effects on livelihoods, stability, and risks can be projected by this software.

The cross-cultural training, which has been used by the CF, is military-specific and military-validated. Therefore, the examples and vignettes have to do with operation specific issues and concepts. This is a huge advantage as the training is more likely to be directly beneficial and more effectively applied when it is on topic. Moreover, training has been validated using soldiers, adding more confidence and weight to its effectiveness. The training format is instructor-led group workshops. It is possible that this traditional format may be intimidating or disengaging for some. The lack of interaction and learner participation could also hinder competency development. Table 11 summarizes the features of this tool.

Table 11. Cross-Cultural Training

Course Name	Cross-Cultural Training
Distributor	eCrossCulture
Description	eCrossCulture offers a comprehensive set of tools meant to improve cross-cultural interactions. Cross cultural training includes five components: 1. Effective nonverbal communication skills. 2. Effective verbal communication skills. 3. Perspective taking. 4. Building rapport. 5. Emotion regulation. In addition to cross cultural training eCrossCulture offers aid and economic development software. This software allows for rapid identification of the population's needs and assessment of the effects of aid and development projects. Immediate, medium, and long-term effects on livelihoods, stability, and risks can be projected by this software.
Advantages	Military-specific and military-validated. Unlike most other tools, this tool focuses on both verbal and non-verbal communication and relationship building. Developed as a more general cultural awareness tool.
Disadvantages	Not interactive, instructor-led training. Even though the course is called cross-cultural training, there is no mention of any specific cultural awareness or language training included in this program.
Previous evaluations	Many of their training programs have been validated by various pilots. Validation subjects are soldiers.
Interface	In-person and online.
Hardware requirements	Computer and Internet access.
Cost to Purchase/Maintain	Unknown.
Remote access	Yes.
Military focus	Yes.
Dimensions addressed	Language and culture.

Course Name	Cross-Cultural Training
Languages available	N/A
Culture specific vs culture general	Culture general.
Modifiable?	No.
Competency development	Verbal & non-verbal communication, emotion regulation, relationship building, perspective taking.
Time commitment	Workshops usually occur within one day.
Use by allies	US and Canada.
Website	http://ecrossculture.com/

2.1.3 Self-Paced Training[2]

This section focuses on the self-paced training tools available for training the various elements of the CA.

2.1.3.1 Integrated Mission Planning Process (IMPP)

The Integrated Mission Planning Process is a comprehensive planning and implementation approach that has been introduced by the United Nations Office of the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). Although not a "tool" in the same sense as the other tools that follow, the goal of this approach is to promote coordinated and thorough peace support missions through the inclusion of a broad selection of stakeholders.

The process is broken down into three stages each with distinct objectives. In the first stage, general planning takes place where objectives, assumptions, and alternatives are outlined. Then, the draft mission plan is operationalized and made deployment-ready with detailed and specific responsibilities. A mission-budget is also developed at this stage. During the final stage revision planning occurs to any demands or objectives that may have altered since the plan had been implemented. There is a continuous periodic review process where mission effectiveness is measured and appropriate changes are made.

The planning process incorporates an array of stakeholders from various positions. When cooperation and coordination occurs, the effectiveness of this approach could be very high because it takes varied perspectives into account and anticipates for interactions between different actors. This approach is highly preventative because it takes into account the entire process and consequently has the ability to anticipate any potential conflicts and plan accordingly. Table 12 summarizes the features of this tool.

---

[2] Note that these programs, except where noted, have not been used by the CF and the descriptions of tools and courses are based on descriptions provided by the source/manufacturer, and cannot be fully verified.

Table 12. Integrated Missions Planning Process (IMPP)

Course Name	**Integrated Mission Planning Process**
Distributor	United Nations (UN) Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)
Description	Comprehensive and inclusive UN system approach to the planning of integrated peace support operations provides a basis for the planning of all new integrated missions, as well as the revision of existing missions for all UN departments, offices, agencies, funds, and programs. There are three stages, each with respective inputs, outputs and decision points: **Stage 1:** Advance Planning, comprising two 'levels' – Level 1 being the Advance Planning to develop strategic options for expanded UN engagement, Strategic Assessment: outlines possible strategic objectives for a UN peace support operation, a range of alternative strategies, options and scenarios for the scope and role of UN efforts, key planning assumptions, and factors and risks that could condition or restrict UN involvement and Level 2 which provides the Foundation Planning as the basis for development for a concept of operations. Secretary General's Strategic planning directive: based on the Strategic Assessment, the Secretary-General decides on the strategic objectives and form of UN involvement **Stage 2**: Operational Planning, again comprising two 'levels' - Level 3 which operationalizes the draft mission plan into an integrated and fully-costed draft Mission Plan, and prepares the transfer of planning responsibilities to the Mission when deployment begins. and Level 4 which covers transition of responsibility to the field (peacekeeping operation). **Stage 3:** Review and Transition Planning, the final two 'levels' – Level 5 which focuses on continuous review and updating of the mission plan where necessary and Level 6 which deals with draw-down of peacekeeping and transition (continuous review process).
Advantages	Comprehensive task force includes representation from political, military, police, security, logistics, humanitarian, development and human rights branches of the UN. Sufficient level of detail that gives the mission direction while also allowing custom components depending on the mission.
Disadvantages	Requires coordination and cooperation of all stakeholders. In the event that this is not achieved the effectiveness of the process could be halted. Does not directly train military personnel for how to behave and interact in various scenarios.
Previous evaluations	None.
Interface	Organizational.
Hardware requirements	No direct hardware requirements. Potentially some sort of writing software, and e-mail/conferencing capabilities to bring varied task-force together.
Cost to Purchase/Maintain	N/A
Remote access	N/A
Military focus	Yes, but it is not limited to military needs. It considers how all stakeholders come together to contribute to the mission objectives.
Dimensions addressed	Collaboration.
Languages available	N/A, not a language trainer.

Course Name	Integrated Mission Planning Process
Culture specific vs. culture general	N/A
Modifiable?	Yes. The detailed planning that goes on within each stage is highly mission-specific.
Competency development	Collaborative planning process.
Time commitment	Months, depends on the mission and resources.
Use by allies	Yes, UN.
Website	http://ochanet.unocha.org/p/Documents/UN%20IMPP%20Guidelines%20(2006).pdf

2.1.3.2 Tools for Operational Planning Functional Area Service (TOPFAS)

Tools for Operational Planning Functional Area Service (TOPFAS) is a software support tool designed to support NATO's operational planning. Planning guidelines include a "comprehensive approach" component with tools designed specifically for comprehensive approach objectives. Some of the featured tools include Systems Analysis (SAT), Operations planning (OPT), and a Campaign Analysis tool (CAT). The SAT supports holistic situational awareness and describes the engagement space as a system with system design and influence relationship paradigms. The OPT is for campaign planning where multi-actor perspectives can be represented in the same plan. This tool answers the what, where, when, and who in a campaign plan. Finally the CAT supports the measurement of progress during a campaign by comparing current achievements to end-goals (measure of effectiveness and measure of performances, respectively). Findings are fed back for future planning. Statistical data analysis is supported by this stage.

The tool allows for collaboration and communication among various actors. This helps ensure that information is shared quickly and efficiently. The software speeds up the planning process because it allows for members to coordinate efforts and updates on one system. Moreover, the collaboration possibilities allow for common situational awareness and better planning synergy and synchrony. This allows for intricate relationships and agendas to come together in a way that benefits the ultimate goals of the mission. A possible drawback to this tool is that it does not provide any actual military training for how to engage in the situations that will likely be encountered. The other tools focus on some combination of language, cultural training, or interpersonal training. While this tool would be an effective way to keep everything organized and directed on a large-scale, it does not provide specific training on how to handle small-scale interactions. Table 13 summarizes the features of this tool.

Table 13. Tools for Operational Planning Functional Area Service (TOPFAS)

Course Name	Tools for Operations Planning Functional Area Services
Distributor	Nato-C3 Agency
Description	TOPFAS is an integrated set of tools (software) to support System Analysis, Operations Planning, Execution, and Assessment of operational campaigns. Information objects created in any one of the tools are available in all others, providing seamless transition of products between various functions of the operations planning group.
Advantages	Collaboration with and between multiple headquarters and staffs from different functional areas. Speeds up the planning process. Allows for a common situational awareness and better planning synergy and synchrony.
Disadvantages	New software may be intimidating. Does not directly train military personnel for how to behave and interact in various scenarios.
Previous evaluations	No.
Interface	Web-based.
Hardware requirements	Word, PowerPoint, Internet, Actual TOPFAS software.
Cost to Purchase/Maintain	N/A.
Remote access	With internet connection.
Military focus	Yes. Also, overall NATO objectives.
Dimensions addressed	Integrated planning.
Languages available	N/A, not a language trainer.
Culture specific vs culture general	N/A
Modifiable?	Inherently.
Competency development	Collaborative planning process
Time commitment	Ongoing (during a mission).
Use by allies	It is used at Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe, all Joint Forces Commands, most of the components as well as those force commands that come for the NATO Response Force (NRF) rotations.
Website	http://www.nato.int/nrdc-it/magazine/2009/0914/0914h.pdf

2.1.3.3 Global MedAid App

The Global MedAid App is part of a multinational technology research project sponsored by the US Army Medical Research and Material Command. This application operates on Apple or Android phones and was originally designed to support health-sector field-related operations in non-combat environments.

The home menu consists of six major content areas, each with its own distinct tools and access opportunities. For instance, the mission tools section has interactive checklists that can be helpful during pre-deployment. Another menu item is the networking option where information can be communicated quickly and effectively across and within organizations. A geographical tracking device allows personnel who are logged in to see the location of other personnel. This information can be categorized by service and department so that if a user needs medical support, for instance, they can determine the proximity of the closest health-related personnel and reach out to them using the App.

The App would allow soldiers to satisfy individual knowledge gaps through accessing specific information on the App such as rules of engagement or a summary of the Geneva Convention. It is highly accessible, as smartphones and other similar devices are common place in today's society. The flow of information and communication pathways made possible by this app could be a huge asset to an operation as it enhances inter-organizational and organizational cooperation. Efficient and effective communication is a key tenet of a successful operation, especially one that is endorsing the comprehensive approach.

The Global MedAid App is a tool that enhances the overall functioning and coordination of a successful operation. It is designed to ensure that the individual gets to where they need to be and provides them with pertinent situation awareness type information. However, there is no inter-cultural training or language training on this app. Moreover, much of the information is general and lacks mission-specificity. A tool such as this may, however, be useful as a collaboration tool within a larger training context. Table 14 summarizes the features of this tool.

Table 14. Global MedAid App

Course Name	Global MedAid App
Distributor	The research was made possible by a research grant awarded by the office of Naval Research global and funded by the US Army Medical Research & Material Command as part of the Coalition War Program.
Description	The menu has six major content categories: Mission tools, learning, library, mission packs, standards, and network. These six categories support mission preparation and performance on deployment. Some highlights of the App include: interactive checklists for pre-deployment, activities to increase awareness of other organizations, materials to allow users to review international rules of engagement, and a networking section that allows the sharing of information between organizations and personnel.
Advantages	Accessible. Use it on your own time for individual knowledge gaps. Enhances communication and flow of information.
Disadvantages	Does not directly train military personnel for how to behave and interact in various scenarios. May not include all relevant information that is mission-specific. Low fidelity. Does not enhance actual interactions.
Previous evaluations	Ongoing.
Interface	Operates on Apple and Android devices.
Hardware requirements	Internet connection. Smartphone.

Course Name	**Global MedAid App**
Cost to Purchase/Maintain	N/A
Remote access	Yes. Programs allow you to record information even without an internet access and then to load that information once you have one.
Military focus	The app was specifically designed for health-care workers.
Dimensions addressed	Collaboration.
Languages available	N/A, not a language trainer.
Culture specific vs culture general	N/A
Modifiable?	Not specifically, although the individual can choose what they access and focus on.
Competency development	Information sharing, collaboration, knowledge development.
Time commitment	Ongoing.
Use by allies	Yes. US Military.
Website	http://www.mole-project.net/the-project/global-medaid-app

2.1.3.4 Operational Language and Culture Training System

The Operational Language and Culture Training System (OLCTS), created by Alelo, Inc., is a game-based software that has been created for and aimed at a military client. The learning modules are simple and broken into meaningful subsections. They build quickly on each other to a point where functional spoken language skills are evident within several hours of training. The company claims that the software can teach anyone to learn the language, even those who believe they have very little language proficiency. Evaluations conducted by both DRDC Toronto and other allied forces do strengthen the claims of Alelo (Holton, Piasentin, Filardo, Thompson, & Febbraro, 2012).

Remote access to this software would allow deployed military personnel to continue their training in the theatre of operation. However, the time commitment necessary to complete this program (100 hours) is unlikely to be available in pre-deployment training. Furthermore, while the student controls the actions of the avatar on-screen, they do not interact with the avatars themselves beyond using the voice recognition software. This reduces the fidelity of the interaction as clicking a button to make an avatar do a gesture is far removed from standing in front of someone and doing the gesture yourself.

Overall, OLCTS appears to be the most widely used tool for training both language and culture though the availability of languages is quite limited. Table 15 summarizes the features of this tool.

Table 15. Operational Language and Culture Training System

Product Name	**Operational Language and Culture Training System (OLCTS)**
Distributor	Alelo, Inc.
Description	The Operational Language and Culture Training System is a suite of game-based courses and simulations. The courses are self-paced, interactive "serious games" with numerous research-based pedagogic and technologic innovations that enable rapid and sustained learning of foreign languages and cultures. The goal of the software is to allow everyone from beginners to advanced students, regardless of their self-perceived learning aptitude or prior language knowledge, to learn and retain functional spoken communication skills after just a few hours of study. A wide variety of training missions are supported including civil affairs, rapport building, reconstruction, negotiations, crowd management, team training, and information gathering.
Advantages	Teaches language phonetically and has several interactive activities that promote both recognition and use of words. Modules are broken up into meaningful chunks to enable a quick progression of skills. Modules also build on each other well.
Disadvantages	Progress is not tracked unless students are on the networked version or on the same workstation. Voice recognition is not always accurate. Using existing variations of language (based on previous knowledge) does not allow for an adaptation of the response. However, there is no evidence of other programs with this capability. Teaches on spoken language. There is no effort to teach the written language.
Previous evaluations	Evaluation conducted by DRDC Toronto in 2012. Several evaluations of the previous version of the software have been conducted including evaluations by the US Special Operations Command, the Marine Corps Center for Lessons Learned, and Alelo themselves.
Interface	PC based interface.
Hardware requirements	**Processor:** PC computers equipped with an Intel Core Duo (or better) processor; or AMD Athlon (or better) 32 or 64-bit processor. **Operating system:** Windows XP (SP3), Vista, or Windows 7. **RAM:** 1 GB running Windows XP; 3 to 4 GB running Vista or Windows 7. **Available hard disk space:** 2 GB (per installed language version). **Video controller card:** Must be compatible with Microsoft DirectX 9 and have dedicated memory. Suitable choices are better NVIDIA® GeForce® 8000 & 9000 series graphics cards, and the ATI Radeon 9800 (or equivalent/better). 512MB video RAM is required on systems using Vista. *Some systems running Vista or Windows 7 may operate the software satisfactorily using shared video RAM. However, support for systems without at least 128MB dedicated video memory should not be implied.* **DirectX 9.0c** (or newer, backwards-compatible version). **Headset:** Noise-canceling digital/USB headset with microphone. We recommend either the Plantronics Audio™ or GameCon™ USB/analog multimedia stereo noise-cancelling headsets. Other noise-canceling type headsets from Plantronics, Logitech and other manufacturers may work with varying degrees of success.
Cost to Purchase/Maintain	$1300 for individual license. Enterprise licenses also available for large groups, reducing per person cost.

Product Name	Operational Language and Culture Training System (OLCTS)
Remote access	Currently available for Apple Mobile devices such as the iPad, iPhone, and iPod Touch, Alelo language and culture apps present the complete lesson content of the Desktop courses formatted for "anytime, anywhere" training. Operational Language and Culture courses on mobile devices are designed for everything from supplemental and/or retention and review training to complete course activity; and all are possible from the palm of your hand. The full course content can be downloaded and installed stateside - or from anywhere in the world where internet access to the Apple iTunes App Store is available - and stored locally for off-line usage in remote areas. Mobile courses are available in the following languages: Pashto, Dari, Sub-Saharan French, and Iraqi Arabic.
Fidelity	Graphics are quite good.
Military focus	Yes, military focus, though based on US military.
Dimensions addressed	Has a significant focus on language, however, it does include cultural elements including hand gestures, instruction on appropriate and inappropriate behaviours, historical and geographical information, etc.
Languages available	Available in Iraqi Arabic, Pashto, Dari, Sub-Saharan French, Indonesian, and Swahili.
Culture specific vs. culture general	Culture specific.
Modifiable?	Not modifiable by the user; however, Alelo does offer development of software specific to a client's needs including conducting interviews with target users and conducting research and analysis necessary to determine what training solutions would have the highest impact on one's organization.
Competency development	Not from the information available.
Time commitment	Full course is approximately 100 hours.
Use by allies	Used by US, Australia, UK, and other NATO countries (e.g., Germany).
Website	http://www.alelo.com/

2.1.3.5 Virtual Cultural Awareness Trainer

The Virtual Cultural Awareness Trainer (VCAT) was also created by Alelo, Inc. While it does provide some basic language training, its primary focus is on operational cultural awareness training. It is a web-based training tool and, therefore, is remotely accessible. VCAT courses also incorporate video interviews with previously deployed personnel with first-hand experience in the target region. Further, the course also incorporates interviews with nationals from the target country in order to get a better understanding of everyday life and customs from the perspective of the local population. The program is largely mission-based, and therefore the training is task-oriented and learners understand how and why to incorporate various phrases, gestures, and customs. Because the focus of this program is largely cultural, the language training is very basic and would have to be paired with some other language training. VCAT Afghanistan has become part of mandatory training for deploying US forces and was developed as a way to quickly develop soldiers' cultural competency in the context of a highly compressed pre-deployment training schedule. Table 16 summarizes the features of this tool.

Table 16. Virtual Cultural Awareness Trainer

Product Name	Virtual Cultural Awareness Trainer (VCAT)
Distributor	Alelo, Inc.
Description	The Virtual Cultural Awareness Trainer (VCAT™) teaches cultural skills specific to the following geographic / geopolitical locations: Horn of Africa, Northern Africa, Afghanistan, and South America. Trainees learn the most effective ways to complete missions in that region using culturally appropriate behaviors and key phrases. Missions covered include Civil Affairs Operations, Security Cooperation, Partner Forces Training, Humanitarian Operations, Illicit Trafficking Interdiction and more.
Advantages	Appears to be very interactive and focused on operational activities. VCAT Afghanistan is considered mandatory training for US deploying forces. Not just focused on dos and don'ts, but rather attempts to develop true intercultural competence. VCAT courses take much less time to complete because it does not focus on the language aspect of training. It does still provide the user with common congenial and command-and-control type phrases. Include Gesture Wizard which includes several commonly used forms of non-verbal communication. This is important as it may help create a more natural interaction and may reduce the chances that an offensive gesture may be made unknowingly. VCAT Horn of Africa and VCAT Afghanistan include basic language survival guides (much like virtual Smart Cards, see Section 2.1.3.7).
Disadvantages	Product appears to be very new, so very few regions are covered thus far. Assumes a level of language proficiency and therefore this is a product that would be added to existing language training, not replacing that training.
Previous evaluations	There have not been any previous evaluations of this product, likely due to the fact that it is very new.
Interface	Web-based.
Hardware requirements	Will run on either PC or Mac.
Cost to Purchase/Maintain	No established prices currently. Cost to be negotiated with Alelo.
Remote access	Because it is a web-based program, it can be accessed from anywhere using the appropriate credentials to log into the system. VCAT mobile courses for Apple and Android mobile devices are also available and can be accessed via the Joint Knowledge Online website.
Fidelity	Excellent graphics. Also includes video content from previously deployed military members who discuss their cultural experiences as well as videos of nationals from the target countries that provide additional cultural insight.
Military focus	Military focus. Developed for US military.
Dimensions addressed	Focus is on operational culture training; language training is only included in VCAT +L courses.
Languages available	Regions available: Horn of Africa, Northern Africa, South America, and Afghanistan.
Culture specific vs. culture general	Alelo claims that VCAT teaches both culture-specific and culture-general skills.
Modifiable?	Not modifiable; however, courses for additional regions are in development.

Product Name	**Virtual Cultural Awareness Trainer (VCAT)**
Competency development	Claim to develop true intercultural competence. No information to support this statement is provided.
Time commitment	VCAT is designed to fit into the user's needs. Therefore, based on the needs of the user and the level of previous knowledge, a subset of basic modules is selected for those with little extra time to learn. These lessons can then be branched into additional modules when deeper understanding of the culture and language is required.
Use by allies	Currently used by the US military and the UK Ministry of Defence.
Website	http://www.alelo.com/

2.1.3.6 Headstart2

Headstart2 is an online language acquisition course developed by the US Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC). The course is comprised of two units each containing 10 modules. While the first module teaches sound and script, the second module is military focused and includes 50 mission-specific tasks. These modules range from establishing public safety to gathering intelligence. The program also comes with printable writing drills which are aimed at familiarizing the user with written script. Headstart2 is available in 21 different languages with new languages being added as they become available. Headstart2 is focused almost entirely on teaching language; however it does include links to cultural resources which allow the user to gain a better understanding of the cultural background. The variety of available languages and the addition of script in the tutorials increase the value of Headstart2 as a tool within the CA. However, the lack of focus on culture within the learning modules is a drawback. Table 17 summarizes the features of this tool.

Table 17. Heartstart2

Product Name	**Headstart2**
Distributor	Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC)
Description	Headstart2 consists of two units containing 10 modules each. Unit One (Sound and Script) teaches the basics of the target language in 20 interactive tasks. Unit Two (Military) consists of a total of 50 mission-specific tasks. These tasks are designed according to military training format and include scenarios covering public safety, medical situations, basic command, cordon and search, and even gathering intelligence. Headstart2 also features over 100 PDFs with writing drills that provide the user with the opportunity to practice writing the target script. Other features include animated capstone military scenarios, culture notes, grammar notes, a writing tool, a sound recorder, a glossary, and a cultural resources section. Headstart2 exposes users to more than 1,000 key terms and phrases, and provides users with important communication tools that they need in preparation for deployment.
Advantages	Includes familiarization with the language's alphabet so that one can learn to read the language as well as speak and understand it. However, this did come quite early in the program and may have been a bit too early in the process to be efficient.
Disadvantages	Lack of early access to interactive scenarios where one could go through an entire conversation makes the process a little more "school"-like and slightly less engaging.
Previous evaluations	No information found, but these courses can be used by US military personnel to earn promotion points.

Product Name	Headstart2
Interface	Online.
Hardware requirements	Web browser, Flash Player 9+.
Cost to Purchase/Maintain	The research team was able to create an account for free and start learning, but only for one computer. Use at multiple workstations requires registration through Joint Knowledge Online (JKO).
Remote access	As mentioned above, an account can be created through JKO to allow for tracking progress using multiple workstations. Each program is also available in a downloadable iPod version for easy portability.
Fidelity	Learning does not involve working through entire interactions, but rather is much more piecemeal (i.e., one phrase, one response). Graphics are relatively good.
Military focus	Program has a military focus.
Dimensions addressed	Focus appears to be almost entirely language, though there are some cultural facts that are flashed on the screen as one is learning the vocabulary.
Languages available	Available in 21 different languages: Brazilian Portuguese, Cebuano, Chinese (Mandarin), Dari, Egyptian, European Portuguese, French, German, Hausa, Iraqi, Korean, Kurmanji, Levantine, Modern Standard Arabic, Pashto, Persian-Farsi, Russian, Spanish, Swahili, Urdu, and Uzbek.
Culture specific vs. culture general	Individual courses are culture-specific, but the focus is on language training.
Modifiable?	Unknown.
Competency development	Course appears to only focus on development of language with minimal cultural knowledge. There is no mention of developing skills to interact with people of different cultures (i.e., gestures, etc.).
Time commitment	Varies depending on the language and the user's learning pace.
Use by allies	Used by the US.
Website	http://hs2.lingnet.org/

2.1.3.7 Countries in Perspective and Cultural Orientations

DLIFLC's Country in Perspective and Cultural Orientation videos are designed as a companion to other DLIFLC materials such as Headstart2. These online videos introduce history, culture, geography and other influential factors affecting a given country or society. There is no language component to these offerings. The lack of interactive engagement of these videos means that learning is passive. This could decrease the likelihood of retaining the information provided in the videos. Each video segment concludes with an assessment to evaluate a user's understanding of the information provided within that segment. The videos seem well done and cover a variety of aspects within the country or culture creating a strong baseline of information that is easily accessible with an internet connection. Table 18 summarizes the features of this tool.

Table 18. Country in Perspective and Cultural Orientations

Product Name	Country in Perspective and Cultural Orientations
Distributor	Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC)
Description	The Cultural Orientations (CO) modules are part of the larger Familiarization (FAM) project, which is an undertaking that was initiated by the DLIFLC in 2003. The Technology Integration (TI) Division makes every effort to find and cite information from reputable sources. Content is presented in objective, fact-based, and non-editorialized form. The Cultural Orientations (CO) offers an engaging introduction to a given cultural group. Linguists and non-linguists alike will benefit from these interactive materials and pertinent language exchanges that are coupled with an objective and practical look at daily life in different contexts. Topics include religion, traditions, family life, and differences in the lifestyles of urban and rural populations.
Advantages	Very easy to navigate and full of information about the history, geography, and culture within a country. No need to learn the language if all one wants is a factual understanding of the country/culture. Does include some key phrases that aid in cultural understanding.
Disadvantages	Not really interactive. Tests appear to be more factual (knowledge of history, religion) rather than cultural. Does not appear to have any kind of operational focus.
Previous evaluations	There is no information about evaluations that have been conducted on these videos.
Interface	Web-based.
Hardware requirements	Any computer with an internet browser.
Cost to Purchase/Maintain	Appears to be freely accessible by anyone.
Remote access	Because it is web-based it is not tied to a single workstation. Does not appear to be available as a mobile app however.
Fidelity	Basically a collection of slides with a few audio clips interspersed. Not realistic in terms of interaction.
Military focus	Doesn't appear to have a military focus. Much more general.
Dimensions addressed	Focus appears to be on learning the culture, but not necessarily learning how to participate in the culture (i.e., learning the facts without learning how to act). Very little language focus.
Languages available	Available for 71 different cultures, from Albanian to Yoruba.
Culture specific vs. culture general	Culture-specific knowledge.
Modifiable?	No.
Competency development	None.

Product Name	Country in Perspective and Cultural Orientations
Time commitment	Videos for a specific country or culture are broken down into short segments covering the various aspects of the country or culture (e.g., Introduction, Geography, History, Economy, Society, Security). Thus videos can be watched in short segments and broken up over a length of time, but in total take no more than a few hours to watch in their entirety.
Use by allies	Developed by US DLIFLC
Website	http://fieldsupport.dliflc.edu/lp/co.html http://famdliflc.lingnet.org/products/cipcovideo/default.html

2.1.3.8 CultureWizard

CultureWizard by RW[3] is a suite of tools geared toward preparing individuals within a multicultural organization to work in a global collaborative environment. Through the use of online training programs, CultureWizard focuses on country-specific cultural awareness training. The culture calculator asks a series of general questions about personal preferences and cultural tendencies. Then, a score is provided for different dimensions such as "structures," "styles," and "interests." The individual is able to compare their own cultural tendencies to that of individuals from various other cultures. The culture calculator tool is a unique way of incorporating and comparing the individual's culture with that of the one they will encounter. Culture Wizard is geared toward a business environment, but does include products that could be translated to a military environment. For example, Commanders might benefit from the available international business management tools for global managers as they focus on managing workplace diversity by focusing on communicating, delegating, mentoring and presenting ideas in culturally appropriate ways. Virtual Team Building and Training Tools for Global Team Members includes lessons on building trust and collaboration within a multinational environment. The greatest drawback of this tool would be the lack of language training to accompany the cultural awareness training. Table 19 summarizes the features of this tool.

Table 19. CultureWizard

Course Name	CultureWizard
Distributor	RW-3
Description	*CultureWizard* is a complete online global management training facility, containing e-learning courses, informational resources, and global skills assessment tools. The *CultureWizard* Learning Tracks tailor the learning experience to the specific needs of each individual and can be customized to integrate with a company's own materials and training methods to meet business goals. Primary learning tracks include: Country-Specific Information, Global Cultural Diversity, Inclusion, and Global Management Skills.
Advantages	Mobile App allows for easy and convenient access at all times. Country-specific tutorials allow for targeted learning where time can be concentrated on location-specific learning initiatives.
Disadvantages	No language training would need to be coupled with language training program. Strict non-tailored tutorials. Strong business application focus. Individualized.
Previous evaluations	No previous evaluations of this program are available.

Course Name	CultureWizard
Interface	Online. Most CultureWizard tools are available on a mobile tablet.
Hardware requirements	Internet Connection, Adobe. Internet access is not required on all tools depending on your equipment and operating platform. Additional tools will be available offline soon.
Cost to Purchase/Maintain	Sold on an annual enterprise license based on employee population. It can start at US $15,000 annually. Annual license is inclusive of all updates, customer support and reports.
Remote access	Yes. Computer and internet access required.
Fidelity	Moderate. Includes videos and tests to facilitate "experiential learning." However, interaction is online and pre-recorded making spontaneous and genuine interaction impossible (with the exception of the in-class tutorials).
Military focus	Business.
Dimensions addressed	Culture (no language component).
Languages available	No language training.
Culture specific vs. culture general	Both. Product includes general cultural awareness tutorials/tests/information in addition to "working with" tutorials where they discuss interacting with one culture specifically (United States, Mexico, Japan, South Korea, Russia, UK Germany, Brazil and China). They expect an additional 3 countries in the first quarter of 2013.
Modifiable?	No. Specific already planned tutorials.
Competency development	Program appears to focus on sharpening cultural awareness, professionalism, problem solving and social skills.
Time commitment	Ongoing. Small time commitment for each demo.
Use by allies	Used primarily by businesses.
Website	http://rw-3.com/

2.1.3.9 Cross-Cultural Programs

A training module called Cross-Cultural Programs is distributed by Language Intelligence. It focuses on language acquisition with courses that use a variety of learning tools including live instruction, online tutorials, portable audio programs and videos. The language programs can be designed according to clients' needs with live instruction, E-coaching or a combination of both methods. This flexibility may be useful in the military setting allowing for live instruction at pre-deployment followed by E-learning once deployed. Programs are offered for all levels of proficiency from Basic Functioning to Full Proficiency. However, limited languages are offered and do not include Arabic, Farsi, or Al-Fusha. Therefore, they may not be useful for the current needs of the CF.

The cultural awareness programs offered by Language Intelligence do not cover a great amount of detail and are only for specific countries such as Germany, Japan, and Indonesia. Moreover, they are designed for cross-cultural business interactions, which are vastly different from the focus that CF requires. They claim to offer "tailor-made" programs; however, as they seem to be based on business-type interactions, it is unlikely that they possess the necessary expertise to design a military cross-cultural program that is both thorough and relevant. Program design would also likely be quite costly. Table 20 summarizes the features of this tool.

Table 20. Cross-Cultural Programs (Language Intelligence)

Course Name	Cross-Cultural Programs
Distributor	Language Intelligence
Description	The programs are intended for managers who transfer overseas or who travel on business, as well as for professionals who work with foreign colleagues or speak with them on the phone regularly. There is also a heavy focus on translation of written documents. Language Intelligence programs can be designed for individuals and small groups.
Advantages	Strong focus on thorough language acquisition. Improve oral communication skills with advanced language learning technology, such as speech recognition and pronunciation tools. Over 2,000 hours of learning activities and repeat activities as many times as needed. Online interactions with "live" instructors. Practice language with convenient 24/7 accessibility. Follow personalized learning paths and participate in lessons and activities created by instructor to reinforce material learned in the classroom. Highly skilled technical staff and professional linguists.
Disadvantages	Business focused. Self-directed (those who lack motivation may not learn much with this model). Cultural awareness training is limited and lacks detail. Available languages are limited and do not include Arabic, Farsi, Hebrew, Al-Fusha. No mobile app or connectivity potential.
Previous evaluations	There have been no previous evaluations of this service.
Interface	Online.
Hardware requirements	Internet connection, Adobe for videos.
Cost to Purchase/Maintain	The cost of the license is $385.00. Individual coaching sessions to accompany the license can be purchased for $48.00 per hour.
Remote access	There are no mobile apps listed for this program; however, it is an online course and therefore can be accessed via any device that has an internet connection.
Fidelity	Small degree of fidelity. The majority of exercises are conducted in a classroom setting using structured exercises. However, one of the phases is practical where interactive exercises are used.
Military focus	Business.
Dimensions addressed	Both language and culture, but separately. Focus is on language acquisition.
Languages available	English, Spanish, French, German, Italian and Dutch.
Culture specific vs. culture general	Culture specific.
Modifiable?	Yes. They include a session where they determine the client's specific needs and objectives. Then, they tailor the program to meet identified objectives.
Competency development	Language ability, cultural knowledge.
Use by allies	No.
Time commitment	The cultural training lasts a half-day, full day or several days. The language component can last significantly longer depending on the client's objectives.
Website	http://www.languageintelligence.com/services/language-learning/

2.1.3.10 Smart Cards

Smart Cards are designed as a custom tool for simple surface-level interactions with locals. Since the cards are customized, they can be an effective way for the individual member to identify what knowledge he/she is lacking and ensure they print a card containing that information. However, it may be difficult for the CF to anticipate what type of interactions they will have, and consequently, what information they should put on their cards. Therefore, *Smart Cards* are probably more useful at providing basic generic information, but more complex training will require another training program. The cards are convenient such that they can be carried on the user at all times and there is no training required. Smart cards could be an effective means of navigating the most basic interactions with locals. Table 21 summarizes the features of this tool.

Table 21. Smart Cards

Product Name	Smart Cards
Distributor	550 Cord LLC (among others)
Description	Smart cards are designed as a quick reference for military personnel to help them with basic navigation through a culture. It lists useful keywords and phrases as well as useful cultural information. These pocket-sized cards are designed to be used by anyone and can be carried easily for quick reference.
Advantages	Small in size, so easily carried. User friendly. No training required. Will allow military personnel to navigate the most basic interactions with locals.
Disadvantages	Very basic. For more complex interactions, the information found on a smart card would not be sufficient. Because the smart cards can be carried at all times, personnel might find it less necessary to learn culture and language and rather may rely on the use of the smart cards.
Previous evaluations	No previous evaluations have been conducted.
Interface	Physical cards; also available as a mobile App.
Hardware requirements	None for physical cards. Mobile App requires iPhone/Android.
Cost to Purchase/Maintain	550 Cord LLC offers an "Army Smart Card Creator" for $29.95. This would allow one to create customized cards as well as give one access to the library of cards already available. Mobile App costs $0.99 per download.
Remote access	Cards are meant to be portable and accessible. Available as mobile App.
Fidelity	Not applicable.
Military focus	Military focus.
Dimensions addressed	Smart Cards can include anything the user would like, which could include basic language keywords and phrases or cultural customs, history, etc.
Languages available	Appears to be available in Iraqi Arabic, Korean, and Spanish, but anyone can create a customized Smart Card to whatever language is required.

Product Name	Smart Cards
Culture specific vs. culture general	Culture specific.
Modifiable?	Highly modifiable.
Competency development	Does not develop competencies.
Time commitment	No time commitment required. Smart Cards are designed to be used in theatre on an "as needed" basis.
Use by allies	Definitely used by US, Canada, and potentially others.
Website	http://550cord.com/products/info.asp?ProductID=8&product=Army-Smart-Card-Creator

2.1.3.11 Rosetta Stone

Rosetta Stone is an online language learning system that emphasizes interactive learning. The program consists of various CD-ROMs, access to an online learning site, and live training sessions with a language coach. It can be purchased online and shipped to the client's address. The primary advantages include flexibility and convenience. The learner can log onto the system and progress through the modules at their own pace. Thus, personnel can access the system when their schedule allows without having to travel to attend learning sessions at pre-determined locations and times. However, this style of learning relies on the motivation of the individual learner.

There is a mobile-App available on the iPad, iPhone, and Android. It offers identical learning activities as the online program making language learning even more convenient because it can be carried around and accessed within seconds. In addition, the novelty and general excitement surrounding Apps and Smartphones may be a positive motivator, making language learning seem like less of a burden. *Rosetta Stone* is designed for language learning only, as there is no cultural component available. Depending on the CF's objectives, Rosetta Stone may be a reasonable solution to narrowing language gaps and improving communication between CF personnel and local populations. However, the lack of military focus, cultural learning, and large time commitment should be taken into consideration. Table 22 summarizes the features of this tool.

Table 22. Rosetta Stone

Course Name	Rosetta Stone
Distributor	Rosetta Stone Ltd.
Description	Rosetta Stone is a popular language learning tool with three components that take place at an individual computer with internet access and webcam capability. The first component is interactive. Basic vocabulary and statements are introduced with text and audio. The learner matches pictures with vocabulary and audio cues. The second component is a live training session with a native speaker of the language. The session takes place online using webcam and internet capabilities. Sessions last 50 minutes and can have as little as 1 to 4 learners in the same session. The final component of Rosetta Stone is the games and community access website. At their own convenience learners can sign onto the network and participate in various language learning games and activities. Games can be played on an individual basis or with other learners online at the same time.
Advantages	Already designed mobile App. Can be completed at own pace. Incorporates online learning and live instruction with a native speaker language coach.
Disadvantages	Does not include any cultural training (aside from some periphery lessons that may be learned as a result of language exercises). Large time commitment.
Previous evaluations	Our search found no systematic evaluations of this program. However, there are countless positive reviews claiming its effectiveness and comprehensive approach to be highly effective.
Interface	There are mobile Apps available. For the iPhone or Andriod: TOTALe Companion. The app contains eighty separate lessons featuring vocabulary, speaking and pronunciation. There are two apps made for the iPad: Rosetta Course® HD and TOTALe Studio™ HD. These apps combine to let the learner do almost everything in the full TOTALe Online version.
Hardware requirements	• Windows: XP SP3, Vista SP2, Windows 7, or Windows 8 • Mac (Intel based only): Snow Leopard, Lion, Mountain Lion (OS X 10.6 or higher) • Internet Explorer 7, Firefox 4, Safari 5, Chrome 8 or greater • Adobe Flash Player version 10.3 or greater • On Windows: 2.33GHz or faster x86-compatible processor OR Intel® Atom™ 1.6GHz or faster processor for netbooks • On Mac: Intel Core™ Duo 1.33GHz or faster processor • 1GB RAM or higher • 1024 x 768 display resolution • High-Speed Internet connection (at least 768Kbps) • USB headset with microphone (not included)
Cost to Purchase/Maintain	Cost depends on duration and language. Standard programs last 12 months and cost roughly $500 US/learner.
Remote access	Yes. Mobile Phone or computer with internet access.
Fidelity	Moderate. Despite the entire program taking place online there are various interactive exercises and live training sessions that make learning from a computer as active and realistic as possible.
Military focus	General Language Acquisition. No military focus.
Dimensions addressed	Language.

Course Name	**Rosetta Stone**
Languages available	Arabic, German, Korean, Spanish, Chinese, Dari, Dutch, English (American), English (British), Filipino (Tagalog), French, Greek, Hebrew, Hindi, Indonesian, Irish, Italian, Japanese, Latin, Pashto, Persian (Farsi), Polish, Portuguese (Brazil), Russian, Spanish (Latin American), Spanish (Spain), Swedish, Swahili, Turkish, Urdu, Vietnamese.
Culture specific vs. culture general	Not Applicable.
Modifiable?	No. Predesigned programs exist for each available language.
Competency development	Language ability.
Time commitment	40–50 hours to complete the content in each level (up to 5 levels). In addition, for the duration online services, the learner has unlimited access to live online sessions and online language-learning community to practice and refine skills. Each learner is different. Some may use the program on a daily basis, while others may log in less frequently.
Use by allies	Unknown. Probably not on an organizational level.
Website	http://www.rosettastone.com/

2.1.3.12 Introduction to Culture

The Introduction to Culture class is run by the US Air Force Culture and Language Center. It takes place entirely online through readings, videos, and simulations with different lessons based on topics such as cross-cultural communication and cross-cultural conflict. The course is online and self-paced, making it possible for the individual to learn at their own speed. However, learning is primarily passive and lacks realism. Consequently, knowledge retention and application may be problematic. The class follows traditional classroom methods of lessons followed by structured tests. Some may find this familiarity comforting while others may not engage with the program because they cannot easily identify direct applied outcomes. Our search found no formal evaluations of this program. Table 23 summarizes the features of this tool.

Table 23. Introduction to Culture

Course Name	**Introduction to Culture (ITC)**
Distributor	US Air Force Culture and Language Center (AFCLC)
Description	*Introduction to Culture* (through readings, video and simulations) explores subjects such as elements of culture, family relationships, religion, belief systems, how one makes a living, sports, and other important cultural domains. It also includes lessons on cross-cultural communication, and cross-cultural conflict reinforced through actual narratives of personal and professional experiences. Current eligibility criteria includes enlisted members of the US Armed Forces (Active Duty, National Guard and Reserve) participating in the Community College of the Air Force Program.
Advantages	Because the course is online and self-paced, an individual can learn at their own speed with access to an instructor for any questions that might arise. More traditional learning, which might be more comfortable for some. Employs a variety of evaluations, therefore not simply based on test performance. AFCLC also offers a course in cross-cultural communication as a follow-on to ITC.

Course Name	**Introduction to Culture (ITC)**
Disadvantages	Because the course is online, it does not allow for the interaction available in face-to-face class situations. Formal classes (even online) might hinder learning for some. Courses are only available at given times. Grades-based course may mean that people are taking the course simply for the grade, not to truly develop cultural awareness. Testing format may not be the most reliable way to test and to teach real-world competencies.
Previous evaluations	There have been no previous evaluations.
Interface	Online course. It is delivered via Air University's web-based Blackboard Learning Management System (LMS). Access to the internet for occasional research assignments is required.
Hardware requirements	The minimum system requirements needed to complete this AFCLC DL program are: Windows 2000 or XP (Home/Pro), 2GB hard disk drive with 650MB free 512 MB RAM DVD-ROM drive VGA or higher resolution video monitor Sound Card with speakers or headphones Keyboard and mouse Internet Explorer 6.1 or higher Adobe Acrobat Reader 6.01 or higher (plug-in for web browser) Adobe Flash Player 10.0 or higher (plug-in for web browser) The web browser and associated plug-ins can be downloaded from the Internet at no cost. Internet connectivity is required to access the required online portions of the DL course, either through a local or wide-area network, or via a local Internet Service Provider (ISP).
Cost to Purchase/Maintain	The course, including all instructional material, is provided at no cost.
Remote access	Online course, therefore accessible from any workstation with internet access.
Fidelity	Because of the lack of interaction, low fidelity.
Military focus	Course is offered by US Air Force; therefore it is assumed that it has a military focus.
Dimensions addressed	Focus is on culture, not language development.
Languages available	Not applicable.
Culture specific vs. culture general	Culture general.
Modifiable?	Not applicable.
Competency development	Claims to develop cross-cultural communication and discusses cross-cultural conflict so might assume that it discusses how to resolve cross-cultural conflict.
Time commitment	There are fall and spring options. The fall course runs October to January while the spring course runs March to July.
Use by allies	Developed by US Air Force
Website	http://www.culture.af.mil/ http://www.culture.af.mil/culture_introcultureclass.aspx

2.1.3.13 Cross Cultural Awareness – Intercultural Communication Training

Cross Cultural Awareness training by Kwintessential offers a wide-range of country and skill-specific courses. The courses are designed with a business focus; however, some of the topics such as personal space norms could be applied to the military setting. Teaching methods include online learning in addition to DVDs. This allows for the modules to be completed at the client's own pace and could fit nicely into a busy schedule. However, complete online learning is passive and consequently may lack realism. In addition, the business focus of the company seems to be reflected in their training approach, so this is a potential drawback. The DVDs may be a useful short-term addition to an already existing training program.

Language courses are offered for all main world languages. They are conducted on a one-to-one basis with a tutor who is willing to travel to the location of the client. However, their main office is in London potentially making travel costs unreasonable. Table 24 summarizes the features of this tool.

Table 24. Cross Cultural Awareness – Intercultural Communication Training

Course Name	Cross Cultural Awareness – Intercultural Communication Training
Distributor	Kwintessential
Description	Offers a series of different courses on intercultural training in the general and specific sense. In addition, tailor-made courses are developed to meet the clients' unique needs. Also provides a series of DVDs with various topic focuses from "Intercultural communication" to "cultural sensitivity".
Advantages	Offer several country-specific courses including Iran and the Middle East. Skill-specific courses are also offered. Varied delivery (i.e., DVD's and classroom courses) allowing different types of learners to engage. Specialized services designed to meet the clients' specific needs.
Disadvantages	Business focus. Language and culture courses offered separately. British company may lack Canadian perspective and experience.
Previous evaluations	There have not been any previous evaluations of this service.
Interface	Online. Online tool called the Argonaut which can be used as part of pre-work, as an intercultural study guide and for online tutorials.
Hardware requirements	Internet. Optional: DVD player and television.
Cost to Purchase/Maintain	4,500 for a one-day program delivery. Pricing for the online tool (depends on the number of participants looking to access it, the access period is for 3 months. They also sell annual organisational licences. Language Lessons: Lesson costs will vary according to language, level, time and place.
Remote access	Online course, therefore remote access is available.
Fidelity	DVD's come with trainer notes and exercises. However, learning is primarily passive.
Military focus	Business.
Dimensions addressed	Culture and language. They partner with a language training provider and generally keep the language and cultural awareness trainings distinct so that the value of each isn't diminished; however, if a blended approach is requested integration is a possibility.

Course Name	Cross Cultural Awareness – Intercultural Communication Training
Languages available	They cover all major world languages. They teach all levels from beginners to advance. Lessons are always tailored to meet the client's specific needs. All course books and material are complimentary. Can occur at home/office or delivered lessons in exclusive London Centre.
Culture specific vs. culture general	Culture Specific courses offered for: China, Germany, India, Islam, Japan, Latin America, Libya, Middle East, Russia, Thailand, UK, USA, Iran. Skill Specific courses offered for: Business and Culture, Expatriate Relocation, Management and Leadership, Cultural Competence, Intercultural Etiquette, Team Building, Communication and Sales Courses, HR Courses, Cultural Diversity, Online Intercultural Learning, Intercultural Negotiation, Youth Cultural Training, Customer Services.
Modifiable?	Highly.
Competency development	Language ability. Cross-cultural interaction preparation.
Time commitment	Anywhere from 1 day to 3 months. Flexible according to the clients' needs.
Use by allies	The company says they work with the defence sector on a regular basis but does not specify which. Possibly American and British because they have main offices in both locations.
Website	http://www.kwintessential.co.uk/cross-cultural/training.html

2.1.3.14 Bilateral Negotiation Trainer

The Bilateral Negotiation Trainer (BiLat) was created by the USC Institute for Creative Technologies for use by the US Army. It is designed to train students to negotiate in a cross-cultural environment using proper negotiation skills, keeping in mind the need to be culturally sensitive. The high fidelity graphics in this program have been designed to create a compelling and engaging environment in which to train. This program has been adopted by the US Army for pre-deployment training for all officers assigned to foreign posts. Thus, the focus on the needs of the military negotiator is a potential advantage of this program.

Unfortunately, while this program is called a trainer, it assumes a certain level of understanding of both culture and negotiation tactics. In that case, it should be referred to as more of a rehearsal program where one can utilize and expand on previously learned negotiation and cultural awareness skills. Table 25 summarizes the features of this tool.

Table 25. Bilateral Negotiation Trainer

Course Name	Bilateral Negotiation Trainer (BiLat)
Distributor	USC Institute for Creative Technologies
Description	BiLat is a portablePC-based training program designed with a specific objective in mind: to provide students an immersive and compelling training environment to practice their skills in conducting meetings and negotiations in a specific cultural context. Students virtually assume the role of a US Army officer to conduct a series of bi-lateral meetings with local leaders to achieve mission objectives. Students must establish their own relationship with these characters and be sensitive to the characters' cultural conventions. Any misstep could set the negotiations back or end them completely.
Advantages	Scenarios are compelling and the characters look realistic creating an engaging training environment. Because it is an interactive computer program, skills can be practiced repeatedly.

Course Name	Bilateral Negotiation Trainer (BiLat)
Disadvantages	Assumes that one is already trained in negotiation and has a background in negotiation strategies. If one does not have this background, then negotiations may repeatedly fail causing frustration for the user and a disengagement from the training. Also assumes knowledge of the other character's culture.
Previous evaluations	No formal evaluations appear to have been done. However, this application did win a 2008 US Army Modeling and Simulation Award and has been deployed as part of a training curriculum for officers assigned to foreign posts.
Interface	PC based training.
Hardware requirements	Unknown.
Cost to Purchase/Maintain	Unknown.
Remote access	Course is available to US Government employees through the MilGaming website. No mobile app is currently available for this program.
Fidelity	Characters and situations appear to be quite realistic so the tool does seem to have some element of fidelity.
Military focus	Military focus
Dimensions addressed	Cultural awareness
Languages available	N/A
Culture specific vs. culture general	N/A
Modifiable?	No
Competency development	Cross-cultural awareness, Communication, Negotiation
Time commitment	Unknown
Use by allies	Used by US Army
Website	http://ict.usc.edu/prototypes/bilat/ http://www.peostri.army.mil/PRODUCTS/USAGFTP/

2.1.3.15 Joint Knowledge Online

Joint Knowledge Online (JKO), available through the US Department of Defense (DoD), is designed as a learning portal that can be accessed by US military, multinational, intergovernmental, and interagency individuals. The courses are geared to allowing a user to function effectively in a joint environment. The wide range of courses available through the JKO allow for independent development of skills in a continuum of learning that develops from basic foundations to deployable capabilities. Because the courses are relatively short, the learner may be exposed to a wide range of capabilities in a short period of time. However, the lack of more long-term intensive training likely means that a deep understanding of the concept may be more difficult to achieve.

The development of a mobile app will allow deployed personnel to continue to train in theatre and will allow quick access to skill training courses that may become necessary in the course of the deployment. However, available information suggests limited practical applications within the courses available online, and thus it does not appear that users can rehearse the activities they are learning prior to applying them in a real-world environment. Furthermore, even though the course is available to a wide range of organizations, the lack of interactive learning may not encourage the knowledge development that usually accompanies joint training.

Overall, JKO provides a useful template for how some CA tools may be made available to a wide range of personnel within the CF. Table 26 summarizes the features of this tool.

Table 26. Joint Knowledge Online

Course Name	Joint Knowledge Online (JKO)
Distributor	US Department of Defense (DoD)
Description	JKO is the DoD unique and authoritative distributed learning capability that delivers global, 24/7 access to Web-based, immersive, interactive training and joint learning resources. The JKO Portal provides access to wide-ranging learning resources including Joint Professional Development seminars, video library, communities of interest and training courses. JKO training content prepares individuals for joint exercises and joint operations. The JKO training audience includes a user-base of military, multinational, intergovernmental and interagency individuals involved in joint and coalition operations. JKO also invests in advanced technology capabilities such as courseware-embedded, intelligent tutor-based, immersive learning environments. JKO targeted training applications providing higher-level interactive courseware utilizing immersive, media-rich environments, and desktop scenario-simulation capability for small group training include the Virtual Cultural Awareness Trainer (VCAT) and the Small Group Scenario Trainer (SGST).
Advantages	JKO provides access to a wide range of courses geared specifically towards joint operations, which include CA operations. A subset of JKO courses is available for non-US military users. JKO courses are geared towards particular communities of interest (e.g., Afghanistan/ISAF). Because the courses are conducted online, they are available 24/7 and can be conducted at one's leisure. The courses range from courses that provide the learner with a basic understanding of the concepts trained to theatre-specific training. The courses have been developed on a continuum in order to build one's knowledge up from a foundation.
Disadvantages	Because the courses are available on-line, there is little instructor interaction which may hinder motivation for taking the courses. While the courses are available to a wide range of learners including NGOs and OGDs, it is unclear how much, if any, interaction takes place between the learners. Thus, the benefit of joint learning might be lost. There are a great number of courses available through JKO that are, to some extent, broken down by functional area and organization, but within these areas, it is unclear which are essential versus non-essential courses.
Previous evaluations	The JKO is a collection of courses rather than one single course that can be evaluated.
Interface	Web-based

Course Name	Joint Knowledge Online (JKO)
Hardware requirements	**Browser:** Internet Explorer 6.0 or Firefox 1.2 **Screen:** 1024 x 768 or better **Java Version:** 1.4 or higher **JavaScript:** Version 1.3 or higher **Flash:** 8 or higher **Windows Media Player:** 9 or higher is required for some courses
Cost to Purchase/Maintain	There is no mention of a cost associated with taking the courses.
Remote access	Because the courses are available online, courses may be accessed remotely with a JKO account. JKO mobile app is also available.
Fidelity	Varies from course to course. Some courses, such as VCAT, have quite good fidelity, whereas other courses are simply a "read and learn" type of course with very low fidelity.
Military focus	Military focus.
Dimensions addressed	Courses vary in their focus from cultural awareness and training to working within joint environments.
Languages available	Not necessarily a language trainer per se; however some of the courses include a language element such as VCAT or Headstart2 which are both available through this system.
Culture specific vs. culture general	Varies from course to course.
Modifiable?	No.
Competency development	It is unclear based on the short course descriptions available online what competencies are developed in the courses available through JKO.
Time commitment	Varies according to the course, but is typically in the range of 1-4 hours.
Use by allies	Developed by the US DoD and available to allied coalition members.
Website	https://wss.apan.org/1539/JKO/SitePages/Home.aspx

2.2   Summary of Comprehensive Approach Training Tools

As a whole, this chapter shows a range of tools relevant to training the CA. The ongoing courses within different parts of the CF show the CF's interest in working to promote better collaboration and communication. Currently, the courses at RMC, CFC and LFCSC all target either junior or senior commissioned officers. Though this is an important first step to promoting a more comprehensive culture within the CF, making the CF more comprehensive will require targeting a broader range of personnel. As discussed below in the course of SME and focus group discussions, the need for a basic understanding of the CA is important across all ranks and roles in the CF, though more targeted training within specific missions and roles was emphasized. The initiatives at the Integrative Peacebuilding Program in Ottawa also seem to reflect an important progression in training, as courses emphasize the participatory integration of military personnel with OGD and NGO personnel.

The 24 training tools identified and rated against key inclusion criteria show a number of potential strengths as well as potential weaknesses. In terms of strengths, all of the tools offer some relevant information about how best to train personnel for the CA. However, the tools vary in their applicability to the military domain, with many of them derived from the business domain rather than

operational environments. As will be discussed in the following section, a subset of these tools was presented to focus group participants. The main issue that these participants highlighted was the fact that the different tools available are limited in terms of their specific focus, with many focusing on language skills rather that cross-cultural competence and others targeting strong relationships with people of diverse cultures to the exclusion of language skills. Given this, no single tool emerged as the logical solution for the CF moving forward, but some tools may offer significant capability for immediate training. Table 27 provides a summary of the key components of the tools evaluated.

Table 27. Summary of key components of evaluated tools

	Remote access	Military Focus	Dimensions addressed	Culture specific vs. culture general	Competency development	Use by allies	Time Commitment
Instructor-Led Training							
Integrative Peacebuilding Program	Yes	Yes	Collaboration	N/A	Collaboration, understanding, engagement	No	5 modules x 6 weeks each
Operational Cultural Training	No	Yes	Cultural and Language	Both	Culture specific communication skills, language ability, increased ability to react thoughtfully to likely situations	Yes	Classes are typically divided up into modules of 45 hours
Cross-cultural coaching	Yes	No	Culture	Both	All targeted competencies could be achieved as long as they are identified at the beginning of the coaching and labeled as training objectives	No	6 x 1 day sessions for each group
Culture Smart! Consulting	Yes	No	Culture	Both	Cultural knowledge, professionalism, social skills, motivation	Yes	Variable
Cross Cultural/ Language Training	Yes	No	Language	General	Language ability	Yes	40 hours of language training and 4 hours of culture training
Corporate Training Materials – Soft Skills Course	No	No	Competencies	N/A	Communication, interpersonal relationship building	Yes	Few hours
Interpersonal Skills Training Centre	No	No	Collaboration	General	Interpersonal skills, communication	No	1 to 2 days
Collaborative Leadership Seminar	No	No	Culture (indirectly)	General	Interpersonal skills, leveraging diversity, influencing/negotiating, public service motivation	Yes	2 weeks

	Remote access	Military Focus	Dimensions addressed	Culture specific vs. culture general	Competency development	Use by allies	Time Commitment
Cross-Cultural Training	Yes	Yes	Culture		Verbal and non-verbal communication skills, emotion regulation, relationship building, perspective taking.	Yes	Workshops usually occur within one day
Self-Paced Training							
Integrated Mission Planning Process	No	Yes	Collaboration	N/A	Collaborative planning process	Yes	Months depending on mission and resources
Tools for Operations Planning Functional Area Services	Yes	Yes	Integrated planning	N/A	Collaborative planning process	Yes	Ongoing
Global MedAid App	Yes	No	Collaboration	N/A	Information sharing, collaboration, knowledge development	Yes	Ongoing
Operational Language and Culture Training System	Yes	Yes	Primarily language with culture elements	Specific	None	Yes	100 hours
Virtual Cultural Awareness Trainer	Yes	Yes	Culture	Both	None	Yes	Variable
Headstart2	Yes	Yes	Language	Specific	None	Yes	Variable
Countries in Perspective and Cultural Orientation	Yes	Yes	Culture	Specific		No	A few hours/video
CultureWizard	Yes	No	Culture	Both	Cultural awareness, professionalism, problem solving and social skills	No	Variable
Cross Cultural Programs	Yes	No	Both	Custom	Language ability, cultural knowledge	No	Variable
Smart Cards	Yes	Yes	Both	Specific	None	Yes	As needed
Rosetta Stone	Yes	No	Language	Specific	Language Ability	No	40-50 hours
Introduction to Culture	Yes	Yes	Culture	General	No	Yes	Variable

	Remote access	Military Focus	Dimensions addressed	Culture specific vs. culture general	Competency development	Use by allies	Time Commitment
Cross Cultural Awareness Training	Yes	No	Both	Both	Language ability. Cross cultural interaction preparation	Yes	1 day to 3 months
Bilateral Negotiation Trainer	Yes	Yes	Culture	Specific	Cross-cultural awareness, communication, negotiation skills	Yes	Unknown
Joint Knowledge Online	Yes	Yes	Varies between courses	Varies between courses	Unknown	Yes	Varies between courses. Typically between 1-4 hours

2.2.1 Recommendations

After reviewing the 24 tools, we identified 7 tools that seem most appropriate to adapt for training CF personnel in the Comprehensive Approach to operations. These can be divided into instructor-led training (3 programs) and self-paced training (4 programs).

2.2.1.1 Instructor-Led Training

The following three programs appear particularly useful for training CF personnel in the CA and are instructor-led.

1. The *Integrative Peacebuilding Program* available through the St. Paul's University in Ottawa is a particularly attractive course. It is open to and, therefore, incorporates both military and civilian students and has specific content regarding the integrative nature of the CA. It requires the students to work collaboratively with other students who are members of other organizations, thereby fostering the contact necessary to develop the knowledge and understanding of the other organizations as well as developing relationships that can be utilized in future operations. Its value is the face-to-face participation of a number of potential players in theatre, which increases the fidelity of the training. It is also instructor-led, so expertise can be utilized. However, it may be limited in scope with respect to the number of diverse operations CF personnel undertake. Tailoring material may help reflect this diversity.

2. *Operational Culture Training* by Communicaid incorporates military knowledge and expertise into scenario-based training, and this increases its overall fidelity. The scenarios are developed by experienced culture advisors that equip trainees with a broad knowledge of a particular culture. This program also includes a language component, which would be particularly helpful when training for the CA as military personnel in this context of operating will likely interact with the local population and hence need a basic understanding of the language. As it is currently designed, however, the time commitment for the course (approximately 45 hours) exceeds the availability of CF personnel during pre-deployment training. If this course were to be adapted for use by the CF, modifications may be required to reduce the number of hours for training. But efforts should be taken to preserve the core teaching points and the positive impact the course has on operational performance and effectiveness.

3. The *Interpersonal Skills Training Centre* through Ryerson University is a unique training opportunity that maximizes experiential learning while developing interpersonal skills, a critical competency for CA. This approach is already consistent with military training exercises, such as Maple Guardian or the CIMIC Operator Course, but emphasizes a skill set pertinent to operating in the CA. Applying this content specifically to select CF exercises may be an effective way to benefit from the centre's expertise in interpersonal training, while maintaining the face-to-face simulated experience, which is the hallmark of CF training. It may also be a reasonably cost effective training tool.

2.2.1.2 Self-Paced Training

Four self-paced training tools appear particularly useful for the CF to train for the CA.

1. The *Bilateral Negotiation Trainer (BiLat)* in use by the U.S. Army teaches culturally sensitive negotiation skills. This is the only interactive computer simulation tool that is designed to train negotiation skills in-theatre. While it was originally designed to train for negotiation with host nationals, it is possible that this program could be adapted for use to

train CF personnel to negotiate with other CA counterparts, such as OGDs. This would require the programming of avatars to respond with typical goals and needs of OGD counterparts. While this could not replace training with actual people, it may be a way to practice training when CA counterparts are unavailable as their time is often limited. To program realistic scenarios, an accurate and comprehensive profile of a counterpart's organization (e.g., specific goals, practices or *modus operandi*, organizational culture, etc.) is absolutely necessary. Any deviation may actually weaken or damage the training outcomes.

2. The *Virtual Cultural Awareness Trainer (VCAT)* created by Alelo, Inc. was created for the practical use of cultural knowledge. It incorporates a variety of training tools from learning modules to interactions with avatars to video interviews with previously deployed personnel and host nation ex-patriots. If these could be adapted to include not only information on host nations, but also information and training on other CA counterparts, this could be a very useful and particularly engaging tool for training the CA to operations.

3. *Smart Cards* can be easily created for any number of CA partners. *Smart Cards* can be created that focus on the host nation itself as well as organizations CF personnel might be likely to encounter or work with in any particular area of operation. They can be centrally stored and easily accessed. *Smart Cards* can also be dynamic, kept up to date during the mission. Providing information about current projects undertaken by various CA counterparts creates situational awareness for the CF. Moreover, this kind of information helps delineate the CF's role in relation to other operational activities, such as development projects. *Smart Cards* could be either physical cards, with information that can be carried into the field, or could be virtually accessible via smart phone apps. This tool might be the single most easily adapted, cost effective tool for use in the CA. An accurate and comprehensive profile of a counterpart's organization (e.g., specific goals, practices or *modus operandi*, organizational culture, etc.) and their activities in theatre is absolutely necessary when building these *Smart Cards*.

4. *Joint Knowledge Online (JKO)* available through the U.S. Department of Defense is not a training tool per se, but rather a portal where tools can be accessed and training can be tracked. A tool such as this that allows for self-paced learning and testing could be easily adapted for use by the CF and could be used not only for the CA, but also for any supplemental training that might be conducive to self-paced learning. Content on JKO could include short course modules, videos, and interactive computer simulation programs. This might also be a repository for information about CA counterparts, etc.

This page intentionally left blank.

3. Training Needs Analysis

Following on from initial work identifying possible tools and resources, it was also necessary to identify current gaps in training for the CA. This was achieved through discussions with experienced CF personnel through SME interviews and focus groups. This allowed for discussion about available tools and guidance regarding their feasibility within the CF training system. This chapter describes the methods used to conduct the training needs analysis and the results of the SME discussions and focus groups.

3.1 Methods

3.1.1 Subject-Matter Expert Interviews

This study used semi-structured interviews with SMEs to identify the current status of CA training within the CF and to help identify the gaps in training that a CA toolkit might fill. Questions for the interview were developed by researchers at DRDC Toronto and Human*systems* Incorporated (HSI®). The semi-structured nature of the discussions allowed participants to elaborate where they felt it was important, while ensuring that all of the points important to the research project were covered.

3.1.1.1 Recruitment

Military SME participants were identified through the existing professional networks of the Principal DRDC Investigator and Co-Investigators as well as the project sponsor. These individuals were contacted by the Principal Investigator to elicit their consent to participate in the interviews. Civilian SME participants were identified and contacted by HSI® researchers to ensure the inclusion of other non-military partners. The purpose and nature of the study as well as the SME's potential contribution was shared in the initial contact. Potential participants were informed that their participation was wholly voluntary and that it would be conducted either in a face-to-face meeting or teleconference with trained researchers. They were informed that the interview would take approximately 1 hour and that the researchers would travel to meet them if necessary. Following agreement to participate, SMEs were sent, via e-mail, an Information Letter describing the study and their role in the study (see Annex A1), a Voluntary Consent Form (see Annex A2), which they signed prior to the meeting, and a copy of the questions that would be covered during the discussion (see Annex A3). A time and meeting place were then arranged.

3.1.1.2 Participants

SME interviews were conducted with 16 participants (12 CF and 4 civilians). Military participants were affiliated with the Peace Support Training Centre (PSTC), Intelligence Analysis Task Force (IATF), Pearson Peacekeeping Centre (PPC), Joint Task Force (JTF), Canadian Joint Operations Command (CJOC), National Defence Headquarters (NDHQ), and Special Operations Forces Command (SOFC). One military participant was retired from the CF. Of the civilian participants, two 2 worked for the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT), one was retired from the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), and one worked for the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP).

3.1.1.3 Procedure

Sixteen interviews were conducted between 16 January and 4 March 2013. Ten were conducted at various locations across Ontario, including Ottawa, Kingston, and Toronto, and 6 were conducted via teleconference with one or more of the research team members present.

Following an introduction of the research team to the participant, the SME was briefed on the purpose of the study, its relevance and potential benefit to the CF, the nature of their participation (i.e., format of the interview, time commitment, etc.), and any possible risks. Before proceeding, the research team collected the Consent Form to ensure that the SME had read, understood and signed it in advance of the meeting.

Before starting the interview, the researcher asked permission to record the conversation as this would provide a more accurate record of the meeting. Participants were told that no one outside of the research team would have access to the recordings at any time and that any issues they raised in the course of the interview would be kept confidential. All SMEs agreed to participate and no SMEs refused to be recorded.

Following this, the researchers began the interview by asking participants to provide a brief background of their career. After the participants had provided this background, the researcher then proceeded to lead the SMEs in the semi-structured interview, allowing and encouraging participants to elaborate on responses where necessary.

Once the interview was complete, the researchers thanked the participants for the interview and reassured participants that their information would be kept confidential. Oftentimes, participants volunteered the names of additional contacts that they felt might be useful resources for the project. These names were noted for potential addition into the focus groups and contacted at a later date by the DRDC Principal Investigator.

No SMEs who participated in interviews were financially compensated for their participation.

3.1.2 Focus Groups

Based on the discussions that took place during the SME interviews, questions were developed for inclusion in the focus group discussions. These questions were developed collaboratively between researchers at DRDC Toronto and HSI®. The questions were aimed at further assessing the current state of CA training within the CF, what counterpart relationships would benefit from CA training (e.g., relationships with OGDs, relationships with NGOs, etc.), the current level of support for the CA within the CF, the personal characteristics important to successful implementation of the CA, an assessment of potential tools that might be included in a CA training toolkit, and potential impediments to the implementation of the CA with the CF.

3.1.2.1 Recruitment

The focus group was mentioned to SMEs during the interviews.. SMEs showing an interest in participating in the focus group were contacted by the Principal DRDC Toronto investigator and invited to participate. Other participants were identified through the existing professional networks of the Principal DRDC Investigator and Co-Investigators, through the project sponsor and through dissemination of a letter from the Chief of Staff Land Operations requesting Army participation. . Potential participants were contacted by the Principal Investigator to elicit their consent to participate in the focus group and to arrange a convenient time for the largest number of potential participants. Potential participants were informed that their participation in the focus group would be wholly voluntary and that it would be moderated by a trained researcher in a location central to the focus

group participants. Further, they were informed that the focus group would take approximately 2 to 3 hours. Following agreement to participate, participants were sent via email an Information Letter describing the study and their role in the study (see Annex B1), and a Voluntary Consent Form (see Annex B2), which they signed prior to the meeting.

3.1.2.2 Participants

Seven members of the CF participated in the focus group that took place in Kingston, on 6 March 2013. Of the seven participants, three were affiliated with IATF, two were affiliated with the Land Force Doctrine and Training System (LFDTS), one was affiliated with the PSTC, and one was affiliated with the Canadian Army Land Warfare Centre (CALWC).

Nine members of the CF participated in the focus group that took place in Petawawa, on 8 March 2013. Eight of the participants were affiliated with the 2 Canadian Mechanized Brigade Group (2 CMBG) and one was affiliated with the 2 Area Support Group (2 ASG). A further breakdown of the demographic information of the focus group participants at both locations can be found in Table 28.

Table 28. Demographic breakdown of focus group participants

Variable	Category	Kingston		Petawawa	
		N	%	N	%
Gender	Male	7	100%	9	100%
	Female	0	0%	0	0%
Age	Less than 20	0	0%	0	0%
	21-25	0	0%	0	0%
	26-30	0	0%	0	0%
	31-35	1	14.3%	5	55.6%
	36-40	2	28.6%	0	0%
	41-45	0	0%	3	33.3%
	46-50	2	28.6%	1	11.1%
	Over 50	2	28.6%	0	0%
Operational Environment	Army	5	71.4%	8	88.9%
	Navy	2	29.6%	0	0%
	Air Force	0	0%	1	11.1%
Rank	Junior NC member	0	0%	0	0%
	Sgt/WO/PO 2/PO 1	1	14.3%	0	0%
	MWO/CWO/CPO 2/CPO 1	1	14.3%	0	0%
	OCdt/2Lt/NCdt/ASLt	0	0%	0	0%
	Lt/Capt/SLt/Lt(N)	1	14.3%	4	44.4%
	Maj/LCdr	3	42.9%	5	55.6%
	LCol/Col/Cdr/Capt(N)	1	14.3%	0	0%
	BGen/MGen/Cmdre/RAdm	0	0%	0	0%
	LGen/Gen/VAdm/Adm	0	0%	0	0%
Number of Domestic Deployments[3]	0	2	28.6%	5	55.6%
	1-2	4	57.1%	1	11.1%
	3-4	1	14.3%	2	22.2%
	5 or more	0	0%	1	11.1%

---

[3] Participants were instructed to count each roto (or rotation) as a separate deployment.

Variable	Category	Kingston		Petawawa	
		N	%	N	%
Number of International Combat Operations[3, 4]	0	3	42.9%	0	0%
	1-2	3	42.9%	8	88.9%
	3-4	1	14.3%	1	11.1%
	5 or more	0	0%	0	0%
Number of International Peacekeeping Operations[3, 4]	0	3	42.9%	6	66.7%
	1-2	1	14.3%	1	11.1%
	3-4	1	14.3%	2	22.2%
	5 or more	0	0%	0	0%
	Missing	2	28.6%	0	0%
Number of International Humanitarian Missions[3, 4]	0	5	71.4%	7	77.8%
	1-2	1	14.3%	2	22.2%
	3-4	0	0%	0	0%
	5 or more	0	0%	0	0%
	Missing	1	14.3%	0	0%

As can be seen in Table 28, the make-up of the groups was quite similar in some respects. All participants from both groups were male and most were from the Army (71.4% in Kingston, 88.9% in Petawawa). Furthermore, most of the participants in both groups had not participated in any international peacekeeping operations (60% of those who responded in Kingston and 66.7% in Petawawa) or international humanitarian missions (73.3% of those who responded in Kingston and 77.8% in Petawawa).

However, there were notable differences between the focus groups at the two locations as well. Overall, the group in Petawawa was younger. While 55.6% of the participants in Petawawa were between 31 and 35 years of age, the age range of the Kingston group was much more evenly distributed from 31 to over 50 years of age. There were two Navy participants in Kingston and none in Petawawa, while there was one Air Force participant in Petawawa and none in Kingston. The rank of participants in Kingston ranged from Sgt/WO/PO 1/PO 2 to LCol/Col/Cdr/Capt(N). However, in Petawawa, all participants fell into two categories, Lt/Capt/SLt/Lt(N) or Maj/LCdr. Most of the participants in Kingston had been on at least one domestic deployment (71.4%), while over half of the participants in Petawawa (55.6%) had not been deployed domestically. All of the participants in Petawawa had been on at least one international combat operation, while nearly half of the Kingston participants had never been deployed to an international combat operation (42.9%).

While the participants in the Kingston focus group were affiliated with headquarters (HQ), the participants in the Petawawa focus group were affiliated with Army units. To ensure a more descriptive terminology is used in discussing the responses of the two groups, the Kingston participants will be referred to as "HQ Staff" while the Petawawa group will be referred to as "Army units."

---

[4] Participants were unsure about the distinction between international combat and international peacekeeping operations. They explained that these terms could be interpreted in many different ways, depending largely on the activities within the mission. For example, though the mission in the former Yugoslavia was officially a peacekeeping mission, CF personnel did participate in combat. To help delineate the missions for participants, researchers provided examples for each type of mission (e.g., Combat Mission – Afghanistan; Peacekeeping Mission – Bosnia; Humanitarian Mission – Haiti.) and asked participants to answer the question in a way that "rang true" for them.

3.1.2.3 Focus Group Procedure

Two focus groups were conducted during the week of 4 – 8 March 2013. One focus group took place in Kingston, ON at the Canadian Land Force Command Staff College (CLFCSC) on 6 March 2013 and the other took place in Petawawa, ON at the 2 CMBG headquarters on 8 March 2013.

Following an introduction of the research team to the members of the focus group, the participants were briefed on the study as well as the steps taken to this point in the research (i.e., research of existing tools and SME interviews). The format and expected time duration of the focus group was then explained to the participants. Prior to the start of the focus group, the researchers collected the Consent Forms to ensure that the participants had read, understood, and signed it in advance of the meeting.

Before starting the focus group, a researcher asked permission to record the meeting as this would provide a more accurate record of the discussion. Participants were told that no one outside of the research team would have access to the recordings at any time and that any issues they raised in the course of the focus group would be kept confidential. All participants agreed to take part in the focus group and no participants refused to be recorded.

Both focus groups utilized the Turning Point system (Turning Technology, 2013) to facilitate discussion. Turning Point is a polling software add-on to PowerPoint that allows participants to anonymously respond to a question posed in a presentation. Participants used a Turning Point Response Card (see Figure 1) to respond to a posed question (e.g., How supportive are the senior levels of the CA training that currently exists? Response ranged from 1/A = *Extremely supportive* to 6/F = *Not at all supportive*).

Figure 1. Turning Point Response Card used by participants in the focus groups

These responses were then transmitted to the Response Card RF receiver and the responses were tallied by the system. Aggregate responses were then displayed in a graphical format immediately following polling. Thus, Turning Point allowed the facilitator to create points of discussion in areas where there were discrepancies in the responses of participants.

Once the focus groups were complete, the researchers thanked the participants and reassured participants that their information would be kept confidential. No focus group participants were financially compensated for their participation. See Annex B3 for the focus group discussion protocol.

3.2 Results

3.2.1 Subject Matter Expert Discussions

The purpose of the SME discussions was to understand the current state of CA training and identify the gaps that a CA toolkit might close. It was also used to understand the issues that were most relevant to the CF with regard to CA training that might be further investigated in the course of the focus group follow-ups. A number of themes emerged from the SME discussions, related to education and training, competencies, and influence activities. Each of these themes is briefly described in the sections that follow.

3.2.1.1 CF Education and Training for the Comprehensive Approach

One of the key issues that emerged in the course of the SME discussions was the fact that each CA counterpart has a unique understanding of the CA with regard to organizational roles and responsibilities. This could create a stovepipe mentality and work against true CA cooperation.

> They all understand basically what it means, but it's very hard to do because you need to have the aim agreed to by all of the various angles of what the Comprehensive Approach represents. It's kind of like light going through glass, it refracts, or through a crystal and it refracts. Everybody sees their lane, their light, their avenue to that piece of glass being somewhat different and that's very problematic.

One of the key gaps in CA training that was discussed by SMEs is the lack of knowledge about CA partners. In particular, SMEs felt that there was an opportunity to not only build a knowledge base, but also to build relationships with OGD counterparts through integrated or combined education. SMEs made the case that it was important to understand the organizational structure and systems (e.g., processes, norms, common practices, etc.) as well as the capacity of OGDs to properly implement the CA within operations. Building a mutual understanding of each other's strategic goals and motives may foster collaboration as each member will be better positioned to offer contributions in support of these. SMEs argued that short presentations during pre-deployment training sometimes presented by CF staff and sometimes presented by OGD members, were not enough exposure to gain a full understanding of one's CA counterparts. SMEs did indicate that a greater understanding of OGDs were developed in CF courses aimed at higher-level officers, but these opportunities for mutual understanding and relationship building needed to be made available to a wider range of personnel as coordination with CA counterparts is often required of them in theatre.

Some of the suggestions presented by SMEs to increase knowledge of other CA counterparts were guest lectures, videos or modules developed by OGDs that might be frequently updated as the organization changes, visits to the organizations in order to get a deeper knowledge base of their organizational structure, as well as workshops and seminars such as the Civil-Military seminar offered by the IATF, Hostile Environment Training (HET) courses, and Strategic Reconstruction Task Force modules developed by DFAIT.

Another critical gap is face-to-face interactions with CA counterparts. This was repeatedly emphasized during SME discussions. As one military SME mentioned:

> It's personality driven. If you don't know about each other it doesn't really work. A military institution is very different from a public institution. We cannot just go out there and do business. It takes a little while, a few coffees, a few dinners, you chat, you learn about each other. And this is where we're lacking; this is what we're not good at.

It was felt that only face-to-face interactions can facilitate true relationship building that is based on respect. And such a relationship can promote more effective cooperation as shared understanding of one another's capacities, respect and openness can help to ensure that individual voices are heard (Thomson et al., 2011).

> *Nothing beats knowing someone, personality-wise, sitting down at a table having a general meeting and saying, "Listen, this is the goal. What do you bring to the table? What can you do for this mission? How can we help each other and who is going to be taking the lead on this?"*

Another issue that was discussed by SMEs was the need to have OGD involvement in training exercises. It was pointed out that exercises that train for joint operations, such as Exercise Maple Guardian or Exercise Maple Resolve, are often lacking an element of CA. It was made clear that one of the issues that cannot be remedied by the CF is the lack of OGD availability for these exercises, despite the view that SMEs see this as critical to their training.

> *Other government departments don't have that capacity. They've got one person in the window and they're either doing operations or…they're doing operations. The ability for them to take somebody out of the line and have them do training and the education is expensive.*

However, it was emphasized that regardless of the presence or absence of an OGD member themselves, some sort of representation of the CA counterparts (e.g., through the use of trained actors with an understanding of the OGD they represent) is necessary. One way to ensure CA training within these exercises even when OGD member participation is not possible would be to have OGD member input in the design of the exercise. It was pointed out that training during these exercises tends to focus entirely on kinetic solutions when the CF takes the lead. However, according to the SMEs in operations, the kinetic solution is not always the appropriate solution, and the CF does not necessarily always take the lead. If this is an unfamiliar position for the CF, then it may lead to struggles over the leadership role and place a greater tension on an already tenuous relationship, thus reiterating the stereotype that the CF "doesn't play well in the sandbox".

> [In the training exercises at CFB Wainwright]*, everything is focussed on kinetic operations. So, it's the Comprehensive Approach for them, but all the scenarios, the solution is the kinetic operation…You have CIDA and you have DFAIT, but they would not be the solution, never. So if you train that you're always the right solution, when you get there it's very difficult to realize that you are not the solution.*

SMEs noted that the realism of the situation with regard to the CA is also not sufficiently considered when exercises are designed. The OGD participants, as pointed out by one SME, are guests of the military during the exercise, and thus, it is important to treat them cordially. However, it was said that there needs to be an element of conflict within the scenario between CA counterparts to reflect operational realities and train conflict resolution skills.

> *Typically the exercises in Wainwright, for example… we'll bring out a civilian component representing the whole of government team and so on. And of course, they are being held hostage in Wainwright by us, fed and clothed, being taken care of and they're all getting along. They're working through the exercise script that we built. What you need to do is build in a great deal of friction. For any particular mission or for any particular challenge the friction can be in execution or the friction can be understanding of the mission or the friction can be both… There needs to be a respect that people approach the problem from different perspectives.*

Perhaps strategies for OGD involvement could be considered. One SME said that the CF course he attended in Kingston was not sold well, despite the high quality of training that he received.

> *I was blown away by the quality of training that was being conducted…I went down because it came out they wanted somebody from* [OGD] *to go down and I was the only one that said, "Heck, yeah, I'll go down." A lot of guys* [thought] *it wasn't sexy, right. "Why would I go …?"*

It appears that a greater awareness of the types and quality of training opportunities available to OGD counterparts might increase participation. While as one participant indicated, a "seat is always open for them," SMEs indicated that available seats are not always filled. However, the value added when that seat is filled has been underscored by both military and civilian SMEs. Not only does it allow for hands on face-to-face training in the CA, but it allows for a greater awareness of each other's organization.

Beyond this basic understanding of CA and a need for greater mutual understanding and relationship building through face-to-face interactions and communal training, other training and education issues within the CF have to do with the timing of CA training. SMEs felt that exposure to the CA often came too late in one's CF career and therefore did not necessarily integrate into the way one saw operations, which was ingrained earlier. It was generally agreed that exposure to WoG partners during the Road to High Readiness training (i.e., pre-deployment training) was insufficient. In fact, some SMEs mentioned that they had not been exposed to OGD counterparts until deployment, at which point delays in coordination and cooperation are common.

When asked to specify at what point in one's career CA training should be targeted, SMEs generally felt that exposure at the senior NCO level (e.g., WO) or junior officer level (e.g., Capt) would be beneficial though some felt that training might wait until the senior officer level (e.g., Maj). SMEs argued that the CA training offered to individuals at different levels would need to be tailored to the roles and responsibilities of those individuals.

> *It's great to say that you're going to have the toolbox for the Comprehensive Approach, but…the Sergeant and Warrant Officer will need different toolboxes than the Captain, Major…It's all the Comprehensive Approach, but who's going to get what?*

However, incorporating CA education earlier into the career plan of military personnel would be challenging, as SMEs implied that training courses are already saturated. Adding a CA aspect to a course would require either adding more to an already overworked course or elimination of another key aspect.

> *Are we going to turn it into professional development and start incorporating it right from the bottom? Great, but what are you going to cut out because all our courses are loaded to the hilts…We keep adding and adding and adding and it just gets muddled all together.*

Combining CA training with other training such as joint operations training could be a way of adding this aspect of training without adding to the workload of personnel. Adding CA training at various levels of one's education allows for repetition, which, SMEs argued, fosters a better understanding of the CA process and allows one to be more comfortable in applying these processes in operations.

SMEs suggested incorporating CA education into an early stage of one's CF career, particularly for CF leadership, as this might help to institutionalize the CA. Junior ranks would, in turn, be exposed to the CA through their immediate supervisors. This institutionalization could then change the way that operations are viewed and how CA counterparts fit into the operation; that is, as full and equal

partners rather than simply as tools to be exploited by the CF. This argument was supported by later discussions within the focus groups.

Participants identified some obstacles that would need to be overcome for CA training to become institutionalized. One of the main issues discussed by SMEs was the need for senior leadership endorsement for CA training. Some SMEs felt that it was imperative that senior leadership be convinced of the operational significance of the CA. Others suggested the creation of CA-specific doctrine as a priority. While the integration of the CA into CF doctrine may be a slow process, the development of doctrinal notes, as discussed by one SME, may be an alternative that allows for the introduction of the CA into operations. Doctrinal notes preserve the information learned about working within a CA environment and can be disseminated to a wide range of personnel, thus having continued impacts on operations.

As pointed out in SME discussions, with the wrapping up of the mission in Afghanistan, the urgency of training for counter-insurgency (COIN) missions may be diminished. Thus, the importance of understanding and training for the CA to operations also diminishes. Less funding is provided for training and the need for CA expertise is seen as less of a priority. The need for senior level endorsement of CA training is critical in having the development of CA expertise seen as a priority. As discussed by SMEs, in order to obtain that senior level endorsement, real life examples of the military advantage of working in a CA and having expert CA operators must be shown. Without this endorsement and the institutionalization of the lessons learned to date, a lack of personnel trained in the CA for future operations may result, as personnel with current CA experience leave the CF.

One tool that was suggested by a military SME to harness the lessons learned in previous CA missions was the Tactical Conflict Assessment and Planning Framework (TCAPF) developed by USAID. TCAPF uses a series of four questions to assess the impact that the organization has had through influence activities. This information is then fed back to headquarters to help create plans for future influence activities. This type of approach, it was argued, could be adapted for use by Canada when assessing the impact of CA activities such as development work done with CIDA. While this type of tool would not aid in the education of the CA, it could help focus the use of the CA for the greatest impact in future operations. Table 29 summarizes the discussions with SMEs regarding training and education issues.

Table 29. Summary of SME discussion – Education and Training[5]

What are the potential challenges	Opportunities
Understanding the Comprehensive Approach	
Everyone has their own unique understanding of what is meant by CA, which may not align with the understanding of other counterparts	Joint training where the understanding can become shared
Knowledge and Capabilities	
15 minute "pitches" not enough	Increased OGD involvement in training prior to deployment
Little input from relevant players (e.g., OGDs, NGOs, etc.); without civilian input, won't really get the CA package	Gain understanding of other organizations (values, motives); learn how they work; increase awareness of what civilian agencies do; Create job descriptions for all organizations and their personnel
Limited OGD expertise on EX thus don't train as a team; OGDs have limited time/people to train with the CF	
Limited training time, given all of the other CF training requirements	Gain understanding of whole operational picture (what's good for Canada from DFAIT perspective and CA); mission specific objectives of other orgs
Access of information to organizations outside the CF may be limited, prevents sharing	Show OGDs what happens without the military in ops
Must be applied or won't learn it – still only theoretical	Provide face-to-face time with OGD personnel; socialize
Not applied to kinetic training (e.g., MAPLE RESOLVE EX; MAPLE GUARDIAN EX); if so only as an afterthought; DFAIT role was not defined on the mil EX – had to make it up, difficult to integrate	Bring CF pers to DFAIT/CIDA to learn about them; bring DFAIT/CIDA to PSTC (exposure)
	The CA approach as the focus of the kinetic training
Resources (money, time, personnel) not remedied by technology	Teach the OPP and other CONOPS to CA counterparts; how to bring in CIDA/DFAIT knowledge to the OPP
Courses are too short (e.g., HET 5 days)	Make DFAIT/CIDA perspective known and meaningful, especially to military planning
Lessons Learned	
Accessibility of information from lessons learned of past deployments/operations (i.e., classified)	CF veterans conduct cross-country tours to various units
Maintain lessons learned from previous campaigns to avoid stove-piping and forgetting	How CA was implemented successfully
	Often learning CA occurs on the ground
CIDA very silent on lessons learned and evaluation of Afghanistan (or classified and under wraps of PCO)	

---

[5] This table summarizes the challenges and potential opportunities emerging from SME discussions. Opportunities included in the table are ways in which the challenges could be overcome. As it stands, the order of the opportunities in the columns do not correspond to any one particular challenge. Some opportunities may address more than one challenge and some challenges may be addressed by more than one opportunity.

What are the potential challenges	Opportunities
Timing of Training	
Exposure to the CA comes too late in career	Integrated into the OPP training
CA does not get integrated in CF way of seeing operations	Institutionalized
No knowledge of CA counterparts for NCOs until deployment training or deployment itself.	Training at the Capt/WO level
Senior Level Endorsement	
CA needs to be endorsed by Senior CF members	Institutionalized
Convince leadership of importance of focusing on planning level (need real life examples of mil advantage)	Have DFAIT/CIDA capacity ready for deployment
Little senior level endorsement re: CA at CIDA	
Little political buy in	
Comprehensive Approach doctrine	
Once Afghanistan (COIN) is completed, go back to training for war; "easy to ramp down" to COIN	Institutionalized

3.2.1.2 Competencies for Operating Effectively in the Comprehensive Approach

SMEs were asked to discuss the need for and potential development of a selection tool for CA operators and what characteristics might be key to CA operators. Table 30 outlines the issues discussed by SMEs in relation to selection tools.

Table 30. Selection tools

What are the potential challenges	Opportunities
Length of time to produce the scale Can't select someone just based on CA	Selecting the most effective resources for operating in the CA to operations Potential characteristics: open-minded, charismatic (e.g., good at building relationships), team player, good communicator

In discussing the need for a selection tool for CA operators, there was a general consensus that a selection tool was not necessarily a priority. SMEs thought that it is not feasible to select an individual simply based on their competencies on the CA. Rather, it was assumed that individuals who are higher up in the organizational command structure who would be likely to influence the implementation of the CA in operations would be those whose very nature was geared towards being an effective CA operator.

When asked to specify what characteristics might be key to an effective CA operator, SMEs listed several key characteristics. Cultural awareness was said to be a critical component of effective CA operations, as shown in Table 31.

Table 31. Cultural awareness

What are the potential challenges	Opportunities
Not producing the intended effects for CA	Force wide
3-5 days depending on CF role in operations (e.g., advisor)	Introduction of App for smart phones/tablets
	Ex-pats (e.g., recent immigrants) with relevant information
Simulations do not provide understanding of personality; not realistic	Interactive modules need to have consequences
	Interactive modules need to be current and have capacity to be updated

An effective CA operator would be an individual who is able to view the world through multiple perspectives and understand and empathize with the culture of the individual with whom they are working, whether that culture refers to a national culture or the culture of the organization. An awareness that the culture from which one stems has an impact on how one operates and views the world is important in understanding how to implement a collaborative project.

Communication skills were also seen to be key to being an effective CA operator. Points raised by SMEs related to this issue are shown in Table 32.

Table 32. Communication skills

What are the potential challenges	Opportunities
Not producing intended effects for CA	Interact with and get to know people from different organizations
Simulations do not provide understanding of personality; not realistic	Build credibility (build trust)
Resources (money, time, personnel) not remedied by technology	Breakdown misperceptions
	Interactive modules need to have consequences
	Interactive modules need to be current and have capacity to be updated
	Learning to talk the same language; shared lexicon of terms/acronyms/concepts – fundamental to get the dialogue going
	OGD expert participation

An issue often found when dealing with CF personnel is the tendency to speak in CF jargon (e.g., acronyms). The ability to communicate outside of one's own organization in a way that makes others feel comfortable is important. Some of the most effective OGD members are those who were previously members of the military as they would be able to communicate in both the civilian and military language comfortably (i.e., they understand "Army speak"). Effective communication avoids misunderstanding between organizations and helps to promote trust.

Negotiation skills are key to working collaboratively to resolve complex issues in an integrative way. Points raised by SMEs related to this issue are shown in Table 33.

Table 33. Negotiation skills

What are the potential challenges	Opportunities
Not producing intended effects for CA Simulations do not provide understanding of personality; not realistic Resources (money, time, personnel) not remedied by technology	Interact with and get to know people from different organizations Build credibility (build trust) Breakdown misperceptions Interactive modules need to have consequences Interactive modules need to be current and have capacity to be updated OGD expert participation

However, negotiation skills also entail an element of perspective taking to ensure that the needs of all players within a CA environment are met to the fullest extent possible. Without fully understanding the goals and outlook of one's negotiation partner, it is difficult to create a solution that will satisfy one's own goals as well as be acceptable to one's negotiation partner. If the solution does not take one's partner's perspective into account it is unlikely that it will be accepted eventually leading to unsuccessful negotiation where neither party's goals are met.

People skills were also noted as critical to CA competence. Points raised by SMEs related to this issue are shown in Table 34.

Table 34. People skills

What are the potential challenges	Opportunities
Not producing intended effects for CA	Develop empathy, compassion
Failure to build relationship with counterparts	Develop friendships
Simulations do not provide understanding of personality; not realistic	Provide opportunities for civilians to share their experiences
Civilians overwhelmed, opinion often disregarded	OGD expert participation
Resources (money, time, personnel) not remedied by technology	

People skills also entails an element of trust and relationship building, the latter identified as another core competency discussed by SMEs. The capacity to develop friendships creates a network of individuals to which one can appeal in a CA operation. Building that relationship across organizations breaks down barriers, not only between the two individuals involved, but across organizations. This working relationship provides counter examples to stereotypes, which may permeate to other individuals in the organizations as they see people working together in a collegial and effective manner.

While SMEs generally believed that these core competencies are part of one's personality, it was suggested that training could help develop these competencies even in those individuals who did not appear to naturally manifest them. The question was how to best train these competencies to the appropriate personnel, within time and cost constraints.

3.2.1.3 Influence Activities and the Comprehensive Approach

SMEs discussed the need for the CA to have an impact on influence activities. The issue with the integration of the CA into influence activities, however, is that intelligence personnel have typically been trained to focus exclusively on the threat.

> *If you have an Intelligence person, the one who will advise the commander about the situation, he will just look at the Brown* [individuals who support dangerous individuals] *and the Red* [dangerous individuals]. *Nobody will analyse the Blue* [neutral host nation population] *and the White* [NGOs, international media, etc.]. *So when you look at the Comprehensive Approach, you need to know* [about] *the Blue and the White because it's a big impact on your strategy.*

Unless the intelligence analyst (IA) who is assessing the information is also trained on the CA, the ability to leverage the full extent of situational information is limited. The recent development of the White cell within the IA community has created a situation where sociologists and psychologists are used to help assess the Blue and White information. However, influence operators have not been trained to use this cell to its full advantage. It was suggested that this training in the effective utilization of White cell information could be embedded in CA training for Influence Operators, such as IAs and planners.

Table 35 outlines the issues discussed by SMEs with regard to the role of CA in influence activities.

Table 35. Influence activity issues

What are the potential challenges	Opportunities
Focus only on Red (danger) and Brown (support Red) assets, not Blue (host nation) and White (NGOs, etc.) assets Information ops would be useful to DFAIT because it's about messaging; keep Orgs messages consistent and provides awareness in ops	Learn how to assess White cell assets through training

3.2.2 Focus Groups

The purpose of the focus groups was to develop a fuller understanding of the training needs and gaps raised in the course of the SME discussions, as well as to take a larger perspective on the issues surrounding the development of a CA toolkit.

The following sections will begin with the discussion of the most likely CA counterparts and the importance placed on the CA within the CF. This will be followed by a discussion of the support that exists for CA training and the impediments that this training might encounter. The core competencies for effective CA operators will then be discussed followed by a discussion of the important features that should be found within a CA tool and an evaluation of some existing CA tools taken from the evaluations conducted in the first part of this report. This section concludes with a discussion of the need to integrate CA partners into the CF planning process.

3.2.2.1 Counterparts in the Comprehensive Approach

During the SME discussions, a great deal of focus was placed on the relationship between the CF and OGDs in the CA. It was important to understand whether OGDs were the main counterpart to consider

in the development of a CA toolkit or whether there were other organizations (e.g., NGOs) that were also important to consider. Participants were asked to rank order the frequency of their work interaction with varying CA counterparts, as shown in Table 36.

Table 36. Ranking of potential CA counterparts[6]

Q: Of these potential counterparts below, please rank in order who you'll likely work with most closely/often in the CA.	
HQ Staff	**Army Units***
Other NATO militaries	Other NATO militaries
OGDs	OGDs
Local populations in-theatre	Local governments in-theatre
Local governments in-theatre	Local populations in-theatre
IOs (specifically the UN)	IOs (specifically the UN)
NGOs	NGOs
Other	Other

Note. *Due to an unforeseen glitch in the software, when the last participant to start answering began to enter their responses, polling for the ranking question closed. Therefore, for one of the participants, only their top ranking was recorded. However, due to that participant's delay in responding, all other participants had completed their rankings prior to this participant's first response; therefore, all other recordings were entered without issue.

As can be seen in Table 36, participants across both focus groups ranked the order of CA counterparts almost exactly the same. The overwhelming majority of participants (88.9% of the HQ staff, 71.4% of the Army unit participants) ranked other NATO militaries as one of the top two CA counterparts with whom participants work most closely/often, followed by OGDs.

In discussion, participants indicated that the frequency of interacting with specific counterparts would depend on the type of mission, the objective of the mission, and one's level of operation within that mission. For instance, combat missions, such as the recent mission in Afghanistan, might mean that the greatest contact is with other NATO militaries. However, if one's role within the mission was in the Provincial Reconstruction Team (PRT),then individuals might work closely with the local government or local population as well as OGDs. On the other hand, in a humanitarian mission, OGDs and NGOs might be the closest partners. So although they highlighted NATO militaries and OGDs as their two most frequent counterparts in CA operations, these will vary according to mission and individual role within the military.

Some of the unanticipated "other" CA counterparts that were discussed in the focus group were contractors (either companies contracted by the Canadian government or other governments within the Area of Operation), the US Coast Guard, and the US Drug Enforcement Agency.

Participants were then asked to rank order the OGDs with whom they worked most closely. The results of this ranking are displayed in Table 37.

---

[6] Rankings were always calculated in the following way: for each participant, the first ranked choice was allocated 10 points, the next choice was allocated 9 points, the next was allocated 8 points, and so on. Scores for each option were then totalled across all participants within a focus group. The scores were then ranked from highest to lowest.

Table 37. Ranking of OGD counterparts

Q: Of the OGDs, which do you work most closely with in the CA?	
HQ Staff	**Army Units***
DFAIT	DFAIT
RCMP	RCMP
CIDA	Other
CSC	CIDA
Other	CSC

Note. *Due to an unforeseen glitch in the software, when the last participant to start answering began to enter their responses, polling for the ranking question closed. Therefore, for one of the participants, only their top ranking was recorded. However, due to that participant's delay in responding, all other participants had completed their rankings prior to this participant's first response; therefore, all other recordings were entered without issue.

Once again, the results from the two focus groups were very similar. Both groups ranked DFAIT and the RCMP as the closest OGDs. Participants indicated that they would work most closely with DFAIT in international deployments, whereas, it was the RCMP in domestic deployments (e.g., Vancouver 2010 Winter Olympics).

Finally, participants were asked whether the most useful type of training one received would depend on the partner most often worked with in an operational setting. In both groups, a majority of participants felt that training would need to be tailored to the CA counterpart with whom one is working (71.4% of the HQ staff, 55.6% of the Army unit participants), suggesting any tool must be malleable to ensure this or that the right tool needs to be used, contingent on the context.

3.2.2.2   Importance of the Comprehensive Approach

Participants were asked a series of questions aimed at uncovering how important they thought the CA was to current operations and how well the current understanding and experience of the CA might transfer to future operations. The results of these questions for both groups are found in Table 38.

Table 38. Results of questions dealing with the importance of the CA

Question	HQ Staff		Army Units	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
How important do you believe the CA is to the success of future CF operations?	5.29	0.49	5.22	0.83
How well does Canada currently implement the CA to operations compared to other nations, such as the UK, the US, Australia?*	4.20	1.10	3.78	0.83
How transferrable are the CA methods used in Afghanistan to future operational environments?	4.67	0.82	4.56	0.88
How important is it that CA training is on-going rather than just part of pre-deployment training?	4.71	0.76	4.89	1.05

Note. All items, unless otherwise indicated, were rated on a 6-point scale with higher scores indicating stronger agreement for the item (e.g., 1 = *Extremely Unimportant/Not at all Transferrable*, 6 = *Extremely Important/Completely Transferrable*).

*This question was rated on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*Much worse*) to 6 (*Much better*) with 4 (*About the same*) as the midpoint.

The results across the two focus groups for these questions were very similar. Both groups reported that the CA was very important to future operations and that training would preferably be on-going rather than sporadic. As one participant pointed out, however, "I don't think it's a big priority around the clock 12 months of the year, but then again, it shouldn't be something that's shot-gunned in at the last minute like it has been in the past." This suggests that there should be some level of ongoing CA education and training.

They also reported that the lessons and methods learned while implementing the CA in Afghanistan could be transferred to other operations so long as those operations were similar to the Afghan operation. Participants indicated that the CA was an extended learning process. Part of this also stemmed from the lessons learned by their CA counterparts. For instance, one participant pointed out that DFAIT had never been in a mission like Afghanistan before. Those people representing DFAIT learned on the fly and were more effective by the end of the mission than they were at the beginning. Another participant also pointed out that relationships that were developed during the Afghan engagement were often sustained upon returning home from deployment. These relationships could then be called upon again in future operations as long as the same players were involved either to implement the lessons learned from the past or to act as a baseline for other types of collaborations.

All participants responded that Canada implemented the CA to operations about as well as other nations. One caveat, however, was that participants also thought that this was a very difficult question to answer as they had little frame of reference for it unless they had been exposed to other nations' CA implementation. Many had no such exposure and therefore defaulted to rating Canada about the same as other nations. Other participants indicated that the response to this question would be dependent on the type of environment. For example, one participant felt that the Americans were particularly good at operational tasks because they have had to deal with them more often (e.g., lessons learned from Hurricane Katrina). On the other hand, this participant also felt that Canadians were particularly good at tactical level operations.

3.2.2.3 Support for Comprehensive Approach Training

Participants were asked a series of questions that were aimed at uncovering how much support they felt there currently was for the CA and the current status of CA in training. The results of these questions for both groups are found in Table 39.

Table 39. Results of questions dealing with training for the CA

Question	HQ Staff		Army Units	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
How supportive are the senior levels of the CA training that currently exists?	4.86	1.21	4.89	0.78
How important is senior level endorsement for the advancement of training for the CA?	5.29	0.49	5.67	0.50
How important is it to start CA training early on in one's CF career?	3.86	1.07	4.00	1.41
To what extent does CA training currently exist for junior level COs and NCOs through the various CF institutions and training facilities?*	2.71	0.49	2.67	0.87
How important is it that all CF leaders get training for CA operations?	4.71	0.49	5.00	0.71
To what extent is the CA integrated in current doctrine?	4.00	1.00	3.89	0.60

Note. All items, unless otherwise indicated, were rated on a 6-point scale with higher scores indicating stronger agreement for the item (e.g., 1 = *Extremely Unsupportive/Extremely Unimportant/Extremely Separated*, 6 = *Extremely Supportive/Extremely Important/Extremely Integrated*). *This item was rated on a 5-point scale from 1(*To a large extent*) to 5 (*None at all*).

Again, there was a great deal of agreement between the two focus groups. Both groups reported that there was a great deal of support for the CA from senior levels of the CF and that senior level endorsement was very important for the advancement of CA training. They also believed that it was very important that all CF leaders be trained for CA operations.

All participants believed that there was less CA training than there should be for junior level COs and NCOs. When asked at what point this training becomes available, one participant responded that it became available at pre-deployment training, which was, for the most part, soon enough. "Six months to 12 months of training with specific enablers or other individuals you're going to be training with is plenty in my opinion." Participants felt that it was somewhat important that CA training start early in one's CF career. However, in discussion after this question, participants indicated that what mattered most was the career trajectory of the person. As one participant stated, "It really depends on what you're doing…a Warrant Officer in a tank troop, he's probably not going to get out of the tank." Thus, the training needed to be aimed early on in the career of those who would most likely be interacting with other CA counterparts and for those whose missions would require them to interact with other CA counterparts. Other participants pointed out that it might be good to be aware of CA training early in one's career, but that one would not necessarily need to be trained in it at that point. When asked to specify a level at which training should be geared, participants agreed that a senior NCO would be appropriate for non-commissioned personnel and that within the commissioned personnel, a second lieutenant would benefit from training as they were in charge of a platoon. However, participants pointed out that the type of operation would again play a part in the need for CA training at different levels. For an international deployment, training would happen "ideally after the Army Operations Course, AOC, where they learn about that stuff. You're looking at mid-level, Captain level. And if you're looking at domestic operations, it could be everybody."

For the most part, participant responses suggest that CA training needs to occur in advance of deployments (perhaps 6 – 12 months before deploying), and that particular individuals should get it rather than force-wide training. Identifying just who should get CA training for a particular mission then would be a challenge to work out.

When asked about the integration of the CA into current doctrine, participants thought that the CA was somewhat integrated into current doctrine. But all participants overwhelmingly reported that CA needed to be integrated into CF doctrine (85.7% of the HQ staff, 100% of the Army unit participants). However, there was disagreement about whether or not a separate or stand-alone doctrine was required for the CA. Among the HQ staff, 100% of participants argued for a stand-alone doctrine, whereas, only 33.3% of those in the Army units argued for it. However, HQ staff were somewhat skeptical regarding the utility of such a doctrine, noting that doctrine is not necessarily followed. Nevertheless, they felt that, for the sake of formality, a doctrine should be developed.

3.2.2.4 Potential Impediments to Comprehensive Approach Training

Participants were asked to rank issues that might be impediments to CA training. Table 40 lists the order of impediments from greatest to least for both groups.

Table 40. Ranking of impediments to CA training

Q: Please rank the following issues in terms of their influence as impediments to training for the CA.	
HQ Staff	**Army Units**
Lack of financial resources	Lack of financial resources
Lack of OGD input into course material	Lack of personnel from OGDs to participate in training
Lack of personnel from OGDs to participate in training	Lack of OGD input into course material
Lack of buy-in from senior leadership	Lack of interest across the CF
Lack of interest across the CF	Lack of buy-in from senior leadership
Other	Other

According to participants, the greatest impediment to CA training was a lack of financial resources. Most critical, and consistent with many of the responses throughout the SME discussions and focus groups, a lack of OGD personnel (for input into training or training itself) was also seen as a serious impediment to CA training. This emerged as a key theme throughout the focus groups. Participants argued that the availability of OGDs was absolutely critical for the proper training and implementation of the CA. The CF cannot train for the CA in isolation. For CA to truly work in an operational environment, the understanding of the goals and motives of all of the players as well as the face-to-face interaction to build relationships and trust need to occur prior to deployment when personnel have the necessary time and capacity. The key theme throughout the SME discussions and focus groups was OGD involvement in training.

3.2.2.5 Required Competencies for Operating in a Comprehensive Approach

Participants were presented with a list of potential competencies that past research and discussions with SMEs had indicated were important for a successful CA operator (see Thomson, Hall, & Adams,

2009). Participants were asked to rank order these from most important to least important. Table 41 shows the rank order of characteristics from each group.

Table 41. Ranking of characteristics important for CA operators

Q: Please rank in order of importance the following characteristics for military personnel to operate effectively in the CA environment.	
HQ Staff	**Army Units***
Flexibility/Adaptability	Communication Skills
Communication Skills	Interpersonal/Relationship Building Skills
Interpersonal/Relationship Building Skills	Open-mindedness
Problem-Solving/Critical Thinking Skills	Flexibility/Adaptability
Negotiation Skills	Negotiation Skills
Inventiveness/Imagination/Creativity	Inventiveness/Imagination/Creativity
Cross-Cultural Empathy	Problem-Solving/Critical Thinking Skills
Openmindedness	Self-Confidence
Self/Emotional Regulation	Cross-Cultural Empathy
Self-Confidence	Self/Emotional Regulation

Note. *Due to an unforeseen glitch in the software, when the last participant to start answering began to enter their responses, polling for the ranking question closed. Therefore, for one of the participants, only their top ranking was recorded. However, due to that participant's delay in responding, all other participants had completed their rankings prior to this participant's first response; therefore, all other recordings were entered without issue.

As shown above, there was some significant overlap between the two groups in their ranking of important competencies for successful CA operators. For example, both groups indicated that communication skills and interpersonal/relationship building skills were among the top three most important competencies. Results suggest that if training skills and competencies for the CA are important to the CF, then it appears that training communication and relationship building skills might be a priority.

However, while the participants in the Army Units rated openmindedness as one of the top three characteristics, the HQ staff participants rated it among the bottom three characteristics. One reason for this could have been a difference in the interpretation of openmindedness. Within the Army units group, openmindedness was equated to "teaching outside of our world." However, there was no discussion as to the definition of openmindedness among the HQ staff. Therefore, it is possible that their varying definitions of openmindedness led them to make different assessments about how it fit into the CA model. Flexibility/adaptability and problem-solving/critical thinking skills were rated somewhat more important among the HQ staff than they were among the Army units relative to the other characteristics.

Participants also discussed the need for both cross-cultural understanding as well as understanding the culture of other organizations (e.g., DFAIT, CIDA, etc.). They pointed out that understanding the culture of the organization with which one was working would help relationships, whether those organizations were outside the CF, such as DFAIT, or within the CF, such as understanding between

Army and Navy cultures. Had cross-cultural understanding been an option, it would have been ranked quite high in the list of important characteristics.

Follow-up questions asked participants to rate how well the group's top three choices were being trained today in the CF training system, specifically for CA operations. These results are shown in Tables 42 and 43.

Table 42. Rating of training for top characteristics of CA operators by HQ Staff

Question	*M*	*SD*
How well is flexibility/adaptability being trained today in the CF training system, specifically for CA operations?	3.71	1.11
How well are communication skills being trained today in the CF training system, specifically for CA operations?	4.00	0.58
How well are interpersonal/relationship building skills being trained today in the CF training system, specifically for CA operations?	4.14	0.69

Note. All items, unless otherwise indicated, were rated on a 6-point scale with higher scores indicating stronger agreement for the item (e.g., 1 = *Extremely Poorly*, 6 = *Extremely Well*).

Table 43. Rating of training for top characteristics of CA operators by Army units

Question	*M*	*SD*
How well are communication skills being trained today in the CF training system, specifically for CA operations?	3.44	1.13
How well interpersonal skills/relationship building skills being trained today in the CF training system, specifically for CA operations?	3.22	0.67
How well is openmindedness being trained today in the CF training system, specifically for CA operations?	3.56	0.73

Note. All items, unless otherwise indicated, were rated on a 6 point scale with higher scores indicating stronger agreement for the item (e.g., 1 = *Extremely Poorly*, 6 = *Extremely Well*).

The pattern of results shows that for those competencies that both focus groups agreed were vital to CA operations (i.e., communication and relationship building skills), the HQ staff group believed that these were being trained better than Army units participants believed, though both thought they were being trained somewhat well.

Emphasizing the role of CIMIC personnel, participants pointed out that such personnel were generally well trained in inter-organizational communication skills, but that this was not the case for infantry personnel. Moreover, verbal communication was considered only part of the picture. Both written communication and body language were also viewed as important parts of effective communication. Though they did not discuss this form of communication training, learning about appropriate body language is a piece of the CIMIC operator course as well as the Military Observer course provided at PSTC. Here trainees learn that body language conveys messages, and they are shown proper posturing in training exercising.

When asked to rate how well interpersonal/relationship building skills were being trained, HQ staff again reported that these skills were being trained somewhat well, whereas participants in the Army units reported that they were being trained somewhat poorly, suggesting that some form of face-to-face training is necessary. As one participant pointed out:

[Interpersonal/relationship building skills] *is a difficult one. We have a generation now entering the military that are all computer based. They can text better than they can talk to people. That's the difficulty with some of the younger guys building interpersonal skills with people that aren't within their own organization…Simple misunderstandings can arise by not standing in front of somebody and talking to them.*

Among the HQ staff, overall participants felt that flexibility/adaptability was being trained somewhat well; however, there was a wide distribution of scores from 2 (*Very Poorly*) to 5 (*Very Well).* When asked to expand on why this distribution of scores might exist, one participant responded:

I rated it somewhat poorly because although in our training to Comprehensive Approach we get exposed to who the other players are, we may even see one before operations, but the general attitude towards it is these people are playing. Sometimes what they bring to the table can benefit your operation, however, you've got a job to do. So in terms of flexibility, from my exposure, it's awareness, it's how we can work together, but flexibility, in no way is it "you should be able to modify and adapt your approaches to be able to incorporate their objectives along with your own." That's what I would see as an example of flexibility. In no way is that ever raised.

On the other hand, another participant mentioned that:

I said "very well" because at a certain level, we do exercises here where…they're exposed to those people and thrown all kinds of red herrings.

Among the Army unit participants, there was disagreement about whether or not openmindedness was being trained somewhat well or somewhat poorly. Specifically, they felt that training that happens at the divisional level may not trickle down, so while the training is sufficient at that level, not all of those who might require CA training have access to it at the necessary level.

Participants pointed out that while these skills may not be trained specifically for the CA, they are a part of training within the leadership courses. In the end, however, participants at both locations indicated that there is only so much training you can do for what are, essentially, personality characteristics. This raises the question of just how to appropriately train competencies that seem to be vital for effective collaboration in a CA environment.

When asked how some of this training might get implemented, participants felt that the most common forms of CA training were exercises, such as EX Maple Guardian or EX Maple Reserve, where either members of OGDs or trained players might be involved and interactions would create training opportunities. However, one participant did point out that the training existed for the worst-case scenario, combat operations, and that the lessons learned in the course of training for the combat operations could be applied in CA operations. However, the priority, he pointed out, would always be to prepare for the worst-case scenario, combat missions. Therefore, there would be no need to create an exercise or a scenario that had no combat mission component as it would not be seen as a priority for the CF.

Participants were also asked whether or not the CF selects personnel for CA operations. There was an overwhelming agreement among participants that CF personnel were not specifically selected for CA operations (85.7% of the HQ staff, 88.9% of the Army unit participants). A majority of participants (57.1% of the HQ staff, 88.9% of the Army unit participants) believed, however, that personnel *should* be selected for CA operations. SMEs indicated that as the most effective CA operators were naturally charismatic, it would be better to select individuals who already have the necessary

characteristics than to try to train those who might not possess them at all.[7] Among those who felt that the CF did select personnel specifically for CA operations, there was disagreement across the groups regarding how well they selected personnel. Among the HQ staff, five of the participants reported that the CF selected personnel somewhat well ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 0$). Among the Army units, participants responded that the CF selected personnel somewhat poorly ($M = 2.67$, $SD = 0.58$); however, only three participants in the Army units group answered this question. The remaining participants in both groups reported that the question was not applicable, since they believed the CF does not select personnel for CA operations.

3.2.2.6 Features of Comprehensive Approach Tools

When assessing the potential types of tools that might be incorporated into a CA toolkit, participants were first asked to consider how well the civilian perspective has been integrated into training exercises. Once again, HQ staff participants were somewhat more positive ($M = 4.14$, $SD = 0.69$) than the participants from the Army units group ($M = 3.22$, $SD = 0.67$). Though speculative, the discrepancy between the two groups may be explained by the fact that the HQ staff participants were more likely to be affiliated with training development and were more knowledgeable about what exactly is available in the wider spectrum of training.

According to a participant in the HQ staff focus group:

> *In Maple Resolve, for example, there are CIDA projects in the scenario, DFAIT programs in the scenario, and opportunities to work with UN, civilian police, correction services, UNHCR for refugees and internally displaced people. That's in there. That's in Joint EX, which would be the big tri-service training scenario, where at the last Joint EX down in Kingston, two DFAIT planners and one CIDA did show up and the DFAIT guys were there for the entire time. That's pretty darn good…From my experience, the invite is always there, but the seat isn't always full and when they do show up, it's excellent.*

From this description it is clear that the civilian perspective is considered in developing the training exercises. However, this may not be obvious to all of the personnel involved in the exercise if the civilians themselves are not present.

Participants were then presented with a list of different types of CA training tools to give them an opportunity to see what exists and to determine if they thought that conceptually these might be useful additions to the current CA training. Results would then indicate what resonates to CF personnel and what does not, helping to hone decisions for the CA training toolkit. Participants in both groups were asked to rank order these different types of tools from most important to least important, as shown in Table 44.

---

[7] Interestingly, this appears to be in opposition to the observations during SME discussions that the development of a selection tool for CA operators was not practical.

Table 44. Ranking of types of tools for training the CA

Q: Please rank these tools from the most useful to the least useful for CA training:	
HQ Staff	**Army Units***
Training exercises that incorporate members of OGDs	Training exercises that incorporate members of OGDs
Guest lectures from CA counterparts	Guest lectures from CA counterparts
Training exercises that use trained actors to represent members of OGDs	Training exercises that use trained actors to represent members of OGDs
CIV-MIL seminars	One or two day awareness visits to OGDs
Classroom training module	Secondments to OGDs
One or two day awareness visits to OGDs	CIV-MIL seminars
Frequently updated videos	Skype facilitated operational scenario exercises with CA counterparts
Secondments to OGDs	Classroom training module
Skype facilitated operational scenario exercises with CA counterparts	Interactive computer program
Interactive computer programs	Frequently updated videos

Note. Due to an unforeseen glitch in the software, when the last participant to start answering began to enter their responses, polling for the ranking question closed. Therefore, for one of the participants, only their top ranking was recorded. However, due to that participant's delay in responding, all other participants had completed their rankings prior to this participant's first response; therefore, all other recordings were entered without issue.

Participants in both groups reported that direct contact with CA counterparts, either through training exercises or guest lectures, were the most useful types of CA training tools. In particular, they explained that training exercises allowed personnel to interact with OGDs in an environment where the skills learned could be directly transferred and applied to an operational environment, and as such were relevant to their training. Again, face-to-face interaction was highlighted.

It was recognized that OGD personnel were often not available to participate in training to the extent that would be useful for CF training and that using trained actors instead of OGD members might be a suitable alternative. However, participants cautioned that unless the actor was highly knowledgeable and up to date on the OGD, using actors might do more harm than good.

> *The trained actors could be a double-edged sword though because they don't really represent that department. And depending on how much background they've been given, they might actually do more damage of the understanding of that capability than benefit.*

Other options, such as secondments, awareness visits, and Civ-Mil seminars, where the CF could interact with OGD members even if it were not part of direct mission training, were generally highly ranked. Learning that did not involve direct interaction with another individual (such as videos, computer programs, and Skype exercises) were seen to be the least desirable type of tool.

For each type of tool, participants in both groups were then asked how often that type of tool was currently used within the CF and how plausible it might be to incorporate that type of tool into current training, as shown in Table 45.

Table 45. Ratings of current use and probability of future use of varying types of CA training tools

Question:	HQ Staff		Army Units	
Considering the tools you just ranked please indicate:	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Classroom training modules				
… how often they occur.	3.00	1.29	1.44	0.73
… how probable their occurrence would be.	4.00	1.41	3.33	1.58
Frequently updated videos				
… how often they occur.	2.00	1.15	1.56	0.88
… how probable their occurrence would be.	1.85	0.69	3.00	1.58
Training exercise that incorporate members of OGDs				
… how often they occur.	4.43	0.98	2.78	1.30
… how probable their occurrence would be.	4.57	0.53	4.33	0.87
Training exercise that use trained actors to represent members of OGDs				
… how often they occur.	4.43	0.53	2.78	1.20
… how probable their occurrence would be.	4.43	0.53	3.44	1.13
Guest lectures from CA counterparts				
… how often they occur.	3.86	1.46	3.11	1.13
… how probable their occurrence would be.	4.29	0.76	3.56	1.13
Interactive computer programs				
… how often they occur.	2.43	1.27	1.11	0.33
… how probable their occurrence would be.	3.71	0.95	2.78	1.86
Skype facilitated operational scenario exercises with CA counterparts				
… how often they occur.	2.29	0.76	1.00	0.00
… how probable their occurrence would be.	3.86	0.90	2.33	1.22
CIV-MIL seminars				
… how often they occur.	3.86	0.69	2.78	1.30
… how probable their occurrence would be.	4.14	0.90	4.00	1.00
Secondments to OGDs				
… how often they occur.	2.86	1.21	2.33	1.87
… how probable their occurrence would be.	3.57	1.27	3.44	2.01
One or two day awareness visits to OGDs				
… how often they occur.	2.71	0.95	2.11	1.54
… how probable their occurrence would be.	3.29	0.95	4.56	1.01

Note. All items, unless otherwise indicated, were rated on a 6 point scale with higher scores indicating stronger agreement for the item (e.g., 1 = *Almost Never/Very Improbable*, 6 = *Very Often/Very Probable*).

Participants in both groups indicated that training exercises (using either OGD members or actors), guest lectures, and CIV-MIL seminars were the most frequently occurring types of training tools. The HQ staff participants, however, believed that each type of training tool occurred much more frequently than did the Army units participants. Again, though speculative, this may be because the

HQ staff was more closely associated with training development and may have had better awareness of the frequency of the occurrence of the various training mechanisms.

The insight of the HQ staff participants into training itself might also explain why their ratings of the probability of the implementation of each of the types of tools mirrored those of the frequency of their occurrence. HQ staff participants discussed the fact that certain tools currently did exist in their training, but may not be pervasive across the entire CF. For example, high readiness courses currently had CA classroom modules as part of their curriculum and therefore the probability of this type of training being utilized was quite high.

In the Army units, on the other hand, participants were much more optimistic about the probability of the various tools being implemented than they were about how frequently they currently occur. For example, participants from the Army units felt that awareness visits to OGDs ($M = 4.56$, $SD = 1.01$), training exercises that incorporate members of OGDs ($M = 4.33$, $SD = 0.87$), and CIV-MIL seminars ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.00$) were somewhat likely to be incorporated into training. In fact, all of the types of tools fell above the midway point on probability of use except for frequently updated videos ($M = 3.00$, $SD = 1.58$), interactive computer programs ($M = 2.78$, $SD = 1.86$), and Skype facilitated operational scenario exercises ($M = 2.33$, $SD = 1.22$). However, there was a great deal of disagreement over their current level of implementation, as scores ranged through the entire spectrum.

One issue that was often discussed with regard to the videos was that the videos they had been exposed to in the past were outdated and therefore meaningless to today's trainees. For example, one participant mentioned:

> *You get a video on whatever other government department and you've got the weird collar and the big sunglasses and the wicked sideburns. It loses all credibility when guys see that.*

Another important point raised was that the focus of the departments themselves changes so frequently that it would be unrealistic to create videos that were up-to-date as they would be outdated too quickly. However, one participant pointed out that social media could be utilized in place of these videos in order to update people's understandings of CA counterparts as long as those tools were being utilized properly (i.e., updated frequently with accurate information).

With regard to the Skype facilitated operational scenarios, participants indicated that this was a promising option to achieve face-to-face interaction with CA counterparts. But one obstacle they raised with this type of training would be both buy-in from the CA counterpart as well as security arising from the use of this type of internet-based technology. Specifically, they argued that this might be an option with OGDs, but may not be a probable option with international or non-governmental organizations (e.g., NGOs), where information about the training might get misinterpreted and even leaked onto the internet, creating a security threat.

SMEs also noted that the Afghanistan mission had been used as a template for future training. However, this might not necessarily translate into other types of missions. In fact, the CF has been on other missions since their engagement in Afghanistan and these missions had largely been ignored in the design of new training initiatives.

Following the rating of the types of tools, participants were asked to rate the importance of particular features of the tools. The ratings of these items are listed in Table 46.

Table 46. Rating of important features of CA training tools

Question: When developing future tools that would be useful for training the CA, how important is it…	HQ Staff		Army Units	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
…that they are available to all CF personnel?	4.29	0.49	3.89	0.78
…that they are cost effective?	5.14	0.69	5.78	0.44
…that they fit within current CF training time constraints?	5.14	0.38	5.44	0.73
…that they are directly trained rather than self-paced?	4.43	0.53	4.44	1.13
…that the training be conducted by military personnel rather than civilians?	3.29	0.76	2.44	0.73
…that it is created specifically for military personnel rather than CA counterparts?	3.71	0.95	3.56	1.24

Note. All items, unless otherwise indicated, were rated on a 6 point scale with higher scores indicating stronger agreement for the item (e.g., 1 = *Extremely Unimportant*, 6 = *Extremely Important*).

Within both focus groups, cost-effectiveness and fitting into the current CF training time constraints were rated as the most important factors to consider when developing useful CA training tools. Participants discussed the fact that they have been told that "not one hour will be added to training" and therefore, if something were to be added, something else would need to be taken away. Thus, training that was operationally relevant for more than just CA training (i.e., training that focusses not just on CA training, but can also train other operationally relevant tasks) would be most beneficial and most likely to be accepted by CF trainers.

While participants did indicate that having training that was available to all CF personnel was at least somewhat important, they emphasized that blanket training for CA across all levels of the CF would not necessarily be the most efficient way to train.

> I don't think you can have one package generic for everyone because, as discussed, it's different. What you're going to talk to a Sergeant or platoon commander about and what he needs to know versus company commander… versus the DIB-level headquarters versus what ASIC…any package has to be tailored to different levels of an organization, but also mission-specific or role-specific. You could have one big package with all the subsets within, but I don't think you can just group it like "Here we go CF." Throw it out to everyone and it's going to be relevant to Private all the way up to General.

The least important factor for both groups was that the training be conducted by military personnel rather than civilians. Both groups felt that it did not matter who gave the training as long as the person who provided the training was someone with expertise.

3.2.2.7 Evaluation of Existing Comprehensive Approach Tools

Participants were presented with a series of tools that had been identified in the initial stages of this project as potential tools that might be incorporated or modified to be included into a CA toolkit. For each tool, a brief description was provided to participants. Participants were then asked to indicate whether or not they had ever seen the tool before, whether or not they had used the tool before, how useful they felt the tool might be for CA training, and whether or not that tool might be adapted to training with OGDs (as most of the tools focused on training to work in a host nation environment).

While there are 24 tools discussed in Chapter 2 of this report, the limitations of the Turning Point system restrained the number of tools we could ask participants to rank to 10. Therefore, only 10 tools were included in this section. The tools that were selected were included because they were developed for a military purpose and were most likely to have been seen or used by CF personnel. The descriptive statistics for these ratings are listed in Table 47 for both focus groups.

Table 47. Evaluation of Existing CA Tools

Question	HQ Staff		Army Units	
	Yes/M	*No/SD*	*Yes/M*	*No/SD*
Operational Language and Culture Training System				
Have you ever seen this tool before? (Yes/No)	71.4%	28.6%	11.1%	88.9%
Have you ever used this tool before? (Yes/No)	57.1%	42.9%	0%	100%
How useful do you think this tool would be for CA training? (1=Not at all useful, 6=Extremely useful)	4.57	1.13	4.11	0.93
Do you think this tool could be tailored for training to work with OGDs rather than host nations? (Yes/No)	71.4%	28.6%	55.6%	44.4%
Virtual Cultural Awareness Trainer				
Have you ever seen this tool before? (Yes/No)	28.6%	71.4%	11.1%	88.9%
Have you ever used this tool before? (Yes/No)	14.3%	85.7%	0%	100%
How useful do you think this tool would be for CA training? (1=Not at all useful, 6=Extremely useful)	4.57	0.53	4.11	0.78
Do you think this tool could be tailored for training to work with OGDs rather than host nations? (Yes/No)	100%	0%	77.8%	22.2%
Headstart2				
Have you ever seen this tool before? (Yes/No)	14.3%	85.7%	0%	100%
Have you ever used this tool before? (Yes/No)	0%	100%	0%	100%
How useful do you think this tool would be for CA training? (1=Not at all useful, 6=Extremely useful)	4.00	0.00	3.11	0.60
Do you think this tool could be tailored for training to work with OGDs rather than host nations? (Yes/No)	85.7%	14.3%	33.3%	66.7%
Countries in Perspective and Cultural Orientations				
Have you ever seen this tool before? (Yes/No)	0%	100%	0%	100%
Have you ever used this tool before? (Yes/No)	0%	100%	0%	100%
How useful do you think this tool would be for CA training? (1=Not at all useful, 6=Extremely useful)	4.00	0.00	3.22	1.48
Do you think this tool could be tailored for training to work with OGDs rather than host nations? (Yes/No)	71.4%	28.6%	100%	0%

Question	HQ Staff		Army Units	
	Yes/M	*No/SD*	*Yes/M*	*No/SD*
Smart Cards				
Have you ever seen this tool before? (Yes/No)	85.7%	14.3%	88.9%	11.1%
Have you ever used this tool before? (Yes/No)	85.7%	14.3%	88.9%	11.1%
How useful do you think this tool would be for CA training? (1=Not at all useful, 6=Extremely useful)	4.86	0.69	5.00	1.00
Do you think this tool could be tailored for training to work with OGDs rather than host nations? (Yes/No)	71.4%	28.6%	100%	0%
eCrossCulture				
Have you ever seen this tool before? (Yes/No)	28.6%	71.4%	11.1%	88.9%
Have you ever used this tool before? (Yes/No)	28.6%	71.4%	0%	100%
How useful do you think this tool would be for CA training? (1=Not at all useful, 6=Extremely useful)	4.29	0.49	4.56	0.73
Do you think this tool could be tailored for training to work with OGDs rather than host nations? (Yes/No)	85.7%	14.3%	77.8%	22.2%
Global MedAid App				
Have you ever seen this tool before? (Yes/No)	14.3%	85.7%	22.2%	77.8%
Have you ever used this tool before? (Yes/No)	14.3%	85.7%	0	100%
How useful do you think this tool would be for CA training? (1=Not at all useful, 6=Extremely useful)	4.00	0.58	4.11	1.17
Do you think this tool could be tailored for training to work with OGDs rather than host nations? (Yes/No)	57.1%	42.9%	100%	0%
Tools for Operational Planning Functional Area Service				
Have you ever seen this tool before? (Yes/No)	42.9%	57.1%	11.1%	88.9%
Have you ever used this tool before? (Yes/No)	28.6%	71.4%	0%	100%
How useful do you think this tool would be for CA training? (1=Not at all useful, 6=Extremely useful)	4.00	0.58	3.33	1.22
Do you think this tool could be tailored for training to work with OGDs rather than host nations? (Yes/No)	85.7%	14.3%	62.5%	37.5%
Simulated Operations via Skype				
Have you ever seen this tool before? (Yes/No)	57.1%	42.9%	25%	75%
Have you ever used this tool before? (Yes/No)	42.9%	57.1%	25%	75%
How useful do you think this tool would be for CA training? (1=Not at all useful, 6=Extremely useful)	4.57	0.98	3.50	1.31
Do you think this tool could be tailored for training to work with OGDs rather than host nations? (Yes/No)	100%	0%	87.5%	12.5%

A larger proportion of participants from the HQ staff group were aware of (but had not necessarily used) more tools than were participants in the Army units group. Again, this is likely due to their roles in training development within the CF. Each of the tools was thought to be somewhat useful in a limited capacity for CA training by HQ staff participants (each $M \geq 4.00$). However, among the Army units participants, many of the tools were thought to be too specifically related to culture and therefore, less useful for CA training in general.

Smart Cards were the most widely recognized by participants, and were rated as the most useful, as cards could easily be developed for particular CA counterparts. This could give CF personnel a quick reference guide to the organizational goals and structure as well as information about key contacts. In particular, participants felt that these would especially helpful for providing information about NGOs or IOs within the area of operation. Having information about these groups and their particular goals and mandates would be more useful than information about OGDs, which, they explained, is more readily available to the CF.

After having each of the tools described and discussing how they might be tailored for CA training with OGD counterparts, participants were asked to rank the tools in terms of their usefulness for the CA. Table 48 displays the ordered ranking for both the HQ staff and the Army unit participants.

Table 48. Ranking of types of tools for training the CA

Q: Please rank the tools you have just reviewed with regard to their usefulness for the CA.	
HQ Staff	Army Units
Virtual Cultural Awareness Trainer	Smart Cards
Operational Language and Culture Training System	Global MedAid App
Countries in Perspective and Cultural Orientations	Simulated Operations via Skype
Simulated Operations via Skype	Virtual Cultural Awareness Trainer
eCrossCulture	UN Integrated Mission Planning Process*
Headstart2	Countries in Perspective and Cultural Orientations
Smart Cards	Operational Language and Culture Training System
UN Integrated Mission Planning Process*	eCrossCulture
Tools for Operational Planning Functional Area Service	Tools for Operational Planning Functional Area Service
Global MedAid App	Headstart2

Note. *This tool was accidentally left out of the original descriptions of the tools which participants were asked to rank. However, participants appeared to know enough about the tool to recognize it and rank it.

There was a great deal of disagreement between the two focus groups on what would be the most useful type of training tool for the CA. HQ staff participants mentioned that training systems that incorporated interactive computer simulations were most useful for training CA. On the other hand, participants in the Army unit group felt that Smart Cards were the most useful for training the CA, followed by an app, suggesting a degree of pragmatism to meet their demands. With respect to the smart cards and apps, they suggested that these would need to be tailored to include information about CA counterparts. Regarding a tool such as Skype, Army unit participants mentioned that this might

allow one to interact with an actual CA counterpart when not co-located, again underscoring the desire for face-to-face interaction.

When asked to rate the usefulness of each tool individually, HQ staff rated the usefulness of Smart Cards higher than any other tool. In other words, when asked to rate the tool from 1 (not at all useful) to 6 (extremely useful), the mean rating was 4.86 ($SD = 0.69$), which was higher than any of the other tools. However, when asked to *rank* the tools from most to least useful, they ranked it among the lowest in usefulness. This was likely due to the low-tech nature of the Smart Cards. HQ staff explained that interactive computer systems are relatively inexpensive and engaging, and might appeal to the younger generation of CF personnel who arguably have a great deal of experience interacting in computer-simulated environments. As stated by one HQ staff participant, "We have a generation now entering the military that are all computer based. They can text better than they can talk to people." One disadvantage of these systems, however, is that they offer fewer opportunities for interactions with actual CA counterparts. On the other hand, programs that allow for interaction with the CA counterparts, such as the Global MedAid App and Skype are also relatively inexpensive and engaging. However, these programs rely on the availability of others for direct interaction or provision of information in the case of the Global MedAid App. Army unit participants also mentioned that the app that was used did not necessarily need to be this one as it may not be particularly applicable to all missions. However, an app that was approved for use with OGDs (specifically CIDA and DFAIT) or NGOs that allowed for this type of connection and information sharing would be useful.

Participants were then asked whether or not there were any examples of a comparable successful effort to train a new skill or area that could be used as a guide (or analogy) to promote CA training. All participants agreed that there were training efforts that could be used as a guide (85.7% in the HQ staff group, 87.5% in the Army units group). Some examples raised by participants were the training done within CIMIC courses and the Operational Mentor and Liaison Training (OMLT). The US Africa Command (AFRICOM) was also mentioned as a template for CA training and organizational structure.

> *If you really go to a Comprehensive Approach, with the empowerment of civilians within the military structure, and if you look at the AFRICOM, they have a deputy commander who's a civilian equivalent to a two or three star. He has military honorarium, has a budget, and his job is to do the comprehensive approach with Africa Command.*

Participants were also asked whether or not it was more feasible that the CF create its own tool or toolkit or that it simply adopt an existing tool used by other countries or agencies. While all of the HQ staff participants felt that the CF needed to create its own set of tools that were specifically tailored for their own needs, only 37.5% of the Army unit participants felt the same way. However, follow-up discussions revealed that neither group felt that the CF should create tools from scratch, but rather needed to modify existing tools to meet the unique needs of the CF.

3.2.2.8 Planning Processes

Finally, participants were asked to discuss the decision-making and planning processes used by the CF and the integration of CA counterparts into these processes. Table 49 lists the descriptive statistics for these two questions across both groups.

Table 49. Descriptive statistics for items assessing decision making and planning processes

Question	HQ Staff		Army Units	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
How effective for the CA are the decision making and planning processes you've been trained on?	4.57	0.79	4.25	0.70
How well do these planning and decision making processes you've been trained on integrate with those used by other government/interagency counterparts?	3.14	0.90	4.37	0.74

Note. All items were rated on a 6 point scale with higher scores indicating stronger agreement for the item (e.g., 1 = *Not at all Effective/Not at all Well*, 6 = *Extremely Effective/Extremely Well*).

Participants within both groups reported that the decision-making and planning processes were somewhat effective for the CA. HQ staff participants were slightly more pessimistic about the integration of other CA counterparts into the planning and decision-making process than were participants from the Army units. However, all responses for this question across groups ranged in the middle of the scale. No one in either group believed that CA counterparts were integrated extremely well or extremely poorly. Discussions suggested there was room for improvement in the integration of decision making and planning processes.

4. Discussion

The primary aim of this research study was to assess the current state of CA training in the CF and determine if there are any gaps. First, an evaluation of potential tools for training the CA to operations was conducted, looking at commercial off-the-shelf material and tools used by the CF or Canada's allies. The initial search yielded numerous possible tools, from which we selected 24 to review. Second, military and non-military SMEs with relevant CA experience were interviewed to begin to identify gaps in the current CF training and education system. Finally, focus groups were held with military SMEs with CA experience to both identify the current gaps and CF training and education needs as well as to help narrow the potential possibilities for developing tools for the proposed CA training toolkit. This section outlines the recommendations that emerged through the course of this study.

The most critical need identified for effective CA training was CA counterpart (specifically OGD) involvement to ensure a well developed understanding of the different organizational cultures (systems, structures, strategies, level of contribution, etc.) and to provide opportunities for face-to-face interactions. A recurring theme that emerged in the SME interviews was a lack of understanding of OGD organizations coupled with a lack of OGD involvement in training. Without direct participation of OGDs, information surrounding the different organizations may be inaccurate and competencies, such as communicating with civilians and building relationships, cannot be appropriately trained. Indeed, CF participants in both the SME interviews and the focus groups emphasized face-to-face training as a priority.

There are multiple benefits to having OGD personnel incorporated into training. One is that the interaction is two-way and thus members of OGDs learn about the CF, not just the other way around.

> *Being able to interact with a person is a two-way street because they interact with us, we interact with them. They go back going, "Hey the green machine's not that bad. Those guys actually do make sense."*

In past research looking at negotiations between CF and NGO members, ratings of one's counterpart immediately after meeting them were significantly less positive than ratings after actually working collaboratively with them (Thomson, Adams, Filardo, Flear, & DeWit, 2013), suggesting that direct interaction and contact may be critical to fully realizing the potential of CA. As SMEs pointed out, mutual interaction allows pre-existing stereotypes to be countered on both sides and potentially creates a mutual respect and relationship building that can be utilized in an operational environment. Collaborative training also creates an environment of knowledge sharing that allows for a deeper mutual understanding of the goals and capabilities of each organization as well as a much needed understanding of the contribution that CA counterparts can bring to bear in operations.

It is imperative that this greater understanding of the goals and capabilities, systems and structures of OGDs, and when possible other CA counterparts, take place in the training environment when personnel have the time to fully integrate the knowledge and learn from one another.

> *If you don't have them there in the exercise, when you're doing something for real and there's more pressure on you then forget about it. You don't inject it in when it's too late.*

Repeated opportunities to integrate the CA into one's interactions with civilian counterparts may help build "muscle memory" that can be drawn upon under stressful situations. However, attempting to integrate these activities into one's *modus operandi* under pressure situations is not likely to be as

effective. Contact with other OGDs in pre-deployment training allows one to develop an appreciation of their counterpart's knowledge and expertise. Having time to understand one's counterpart in training makes it more likely that their expertise will be elicited in-theatre.

> *If they're not forced to apply these theories and liaise and coordinate with these different [counterparts] as human beings, or a telephone call that represents these people, whether it be planning or actually on the ground, if they're not forced to apply that, it's of no consequence to them and it's right click, delete on all of that information. So in their planning phase, when they're doing it for real, they're not going to seek out the coordination and liaison with these other players if in training they haven't been forced to.*

In other words, waiting until one gets into operation is too late, as the knowledge and expertise that members of other organizations bring to the table may have already been overshadowed by the salient pressures of the day-to-day mission. In these circumstances, one may simply fall back on previous approaches and networks, rather than working to find the best resources and practices. If the inclination to rely on the skills and expertise of CA counterparts is not already a common response, developed in training, it will not be the default response.

The integration of OGDs into training could take advantage of the fact that civilians can provide important advice about how military personnel could best enact the CA. They could provide input into scenario or tool development to ensure that the CA is viewed from a broad perspective rather than from a purely military perspective. Indeed, perspective taking was raised by some participants as vital to an actual comprehension of the CA.

It is very important that training is also relevant to operations and targets the appropriate skills or competencies, and this requires a certain level of fidelity. SMEs complained that current CA training scenarios make it appear that everyone gets along well. Since OGD personnel are invited on exercises as guests, they are treated cordially. However, as research shows, in operational situations there will naturally be friction and disagreements over the best way to carry out a mission and over who has jurisdiction in a given operation (Holton et al., 2011; Thomson et al., 2010; Thomson et al., 2011). It is working through diverging goals on the backdrop of different organizational cultures that may need to be overcome through more effective CA training. SMEs suggested adding some level of conflict into the CA training scenarios. Unless personnel have been adequately trained to deal with this type of conflict prior to deployment, it could serve as justification for abandoning the CA altogether. Indeed, learning how to manage conflict and working well with others demands a set of competencies that might be unique to the CA and may be in need of training. SMEs identified communication and relationship building skills as important competencies to have for the CA, but also suggested that these have not been adequately trained. The use of realistic, face-to-face scenarios with CA counterparts is certainly an option for skill acquisition.

One hindrance to course material development and effective, realistic CA training, again, is the fact that OGD personnel are often unavailable. A reasonable alternative to the use of employed OGD personnel is the use of retired or unemployed former OGD members with knowledge and expertise surrounding these issues.

> *We all agree that these organizations don't have a lot of depth because they're doing real-time work. They're not training institutions like we are. But there's a lot of them, because of the pink slips lately, that are out there that have experience from Afghanistan….If the army or the military can't get the guest lecturers from CIDA and DFAIT because they can't come, there's lots of them out there that will probably come and be able to give you experience…tell you how the organization ran at that time and some of the problems they encountered when*

they were in Afghanistan or Sudan or Haiti…And they could be our actors and work in our headquarters. So we would get the same interaction. They're the ones with the experience, not the senior leadership of those organizations.

This alternative would allow realistic, relevant training to take place in order to enable the development of knowledge about the OGDs. And participants did mention that OGD involvement could take the form of a co-participant or an instructor. Unfortunately, even this approach does not allow for the development of relationships with personnel from varying organizations that one will encounter on operations. As noted, face-to-face interaction with those you will be working with in theatre has been raised by SMEs as vital to the effective implementation of the CA in operations. Ultimately, the solution must incorporate interactions with many different CA counterparts, not just OGDs, and provide opportunities to work with them in environments and situations that are operationally relevant.

Another consideration for the CA to operations is the vast array of different cultures and languages of participating CA counterparts, ranging from NATO militaries to OGDs to various host populations to NGOs. As such, participants explained that CA training needs to go beyond the language and culture training that is already received as part of pre-deployment training. In this case, tools such as the OLCTS by Alelo, or Headstart2 by the DLIFLC in the US, are insufficient for training the CA because they are primarily targeting specific culture and language aspects of the operational environment. On the other hand, other tools such as the VCAT (that incorporate interviews and testimonials with previously deployed personnel and foreign nationals that provide a deeper insight into lessons learned) could be adapted for use in the CA. If similar computer programs were developed to focus on interactions with CA counterparts, for example DFAIT and CIDA, then this type of tool may provide a useful step in the training process. As indicated earlier, participants said that they often worked with OGDs in operations as part of the CA and some mentioned that tailoring these cultural learning tools to include OGDs would be useful for training.

As mentioned above, it is critical that training is operationally relevant. Any tool that is adopted for CA training, therefore, needs to ensure high fidelity. Emphasizing a pragmatic approach to training, participants mentioned that users of the training system need to be able to see how the training they receive can be applied in operations. In this case, passive tools, such as videos, that provide information about other organizations (but require little to no interaction on the part of the end user), are seen as limited in their application. Interactive tools that require responses from the user and result in immediate consequences may increase the relevance of the training. In the focus group discussions, the VCAT system and simulated operations via Skype were the only tools that were consistently ranked among the top five tools with regard to usefulness. In both of these tools, scenarios could be developed that go beyond cultural awareness and require a level of interaction (either with the system or with another person) that could have CA components.

Other important needs raised by participants were learning how CA applies or does not apply to CF operations, understanding that the CA will vary with missions and roles (and ranks); knowing who should receive training; and the resources (time and money) required to maximize training. SMEs and focus group participants mentioned that there was no "one size fits all" solution to training for the CA. The nature of the mission, the objective of the operation, and one's role within the operation all need to be considered when determining the best approach to training. The first goal of training needs to be instructing personnel so that he or she understands where and when the CA is appropriate to a mission.

If you actually look at the problem and you understand the nature of the problem, and then you look at the tool set you have available, if there is too much friction and challenge to bringing the toolset to bear, the Comprehensive toolset to bear, if it's too hard, then maybe don't use it. If you're a hammer and it's not a nail, maybe you should get another tool or find something else to hit.

The CA cannot be seen as a template to be used within every mission without consideration of the objectives of the mission and the tools available to be used in the course of that mission. Training and education needs to help an individual make these decisions (i.e., to decide when it is appropriate to consider the CA in any given operation). SMEs emphasized that CA training should not simply be applied in a blanket format to all CF operations;, rather, the CA is highly dependent on the overall mission. It is important to understand that CF missions are varied and that not all missions will look like the Afghan mission, where much of the previous CA training has been focused.

The CF have done other missions since Afghanistan and we're only still focusing on Afghanistan, so if we're using that as a snapshot all the time, we're going to fail because we've done other things since Afghanistan.

Learning to decipher when a mission is comprehensive is one aspect of training for soldiers.

Beyond the mission itself, the role of the individual within that mission and the level of interaction that individual might have with CA counterparts must be considered for effective and efficient CA training. While it was generally agreed that CA training should be potentially available force-wide, SMEs argued that not everyone within the forces *needs* CA training. If the role of an individual would never bring them into contact with CA counterparts, training that individual for CA would, some argued, be a waste of time and money, both of which were cited as significant impediments to CA training in general. The key to effective CA training that is seen to add value to operations will require tailoring the level of CA exposure to one's role, which is dependent on a particular mission. One suggestion that was made by participants in the focus groups was that the training be added in gradations.

You just can't throw it into a training scenario and the first time they've ever seen a DFAIT person is during that. So some of those [other types of training, such as guest lectures and training modules] *will be pre-cursors, individual training going towards collective training for an exercise.*

Simple exposure to the CA within the lower ranks would be appropriate and could be achieved through passive, self-paced training as available in tools such as the Countries in Perspective and Cultural Orientations videos. As the CA becomes more relevant to one's role in operations, a more intensive training would become pertinent.

Focusing on the right level of training at the right time ensures that the interest in CA training is sustained and does not diminish due to the irrelevance seen by non-users.

I think it's important that CA doesn't become just a new buzzword and we try to over-extend it. You need to pick your audience. You need to know when is it going to be introduced, who's going to receive this type of training because otherwise it's just going to be something that's out there very loud for a few years and then it will fade away because it won't be applicable to everybody in the CF at every rank.

This also has the effect of maximizing resources as time and money will be a factor in CA training.

Overall, military SMEs showed considerable interest and motivation to advance training and understanding of the CA. They viewed it as a probable way to conduct some, but not all CF operations in the future. In other words, not every CF operation will adopt the CA, but the only way to make an informed decision about whether the CA is appropriate within a given mission is to be armed with knowledge. Based on their input and expertise, there seem to be a number of critical gaps that could be filled for CF training the CA. Table 50 lists the core needs raised in the interviews and focus groups.

Table 50. CF Needs for Training the Comprehensive Approach

Needs	Opportunities
Greater understanding of OGD organizations	Classroom or online modules that provide in-depth information about the OGDs
	Guest lectures/videos created and presented by OGD members
	Development of smart cards detailing OGD organizational culture (e.g., systems, strategic goals, etc.)
OGD involvement in CF training course development to ensure accuracy of content material	Consultation with OGD personnel
OGD involvement in CF training exercises to ensure face-to-face interactions	Inclusion of OGDs and CA scenarios in CF training exercises
	Simulated operations via computer interfaces such as Skype
Communication and relationship building skill development	Development of performance measures with experts
	Classroom and online modules that train communication and relationship building skills
Greater culture awareness training	Utilization of ex-patriots for material development, including culture-specific norms/patterns of behaviour
	Interactive computer programs that develop specific and general cultural awareness
Training to be targeted to the right CF audience at the right time	Modules tailored specifically to role and rank
Understanding when CA is appropriate for CF operations	Classroom theoretical discussions regarding CA
Ensuring that CA training fits into current fiscal and time constraints	Mindful of costs and time constraints when implementing potential tools

4.1 Recommendations

Based on the findings of the training needs analysis, the next step is to identify what could be included in a training toolbox that specifically addresses the CA. Based on the evaluation of existing

tools and discussions with SMEs and focus groups, the following list describes a graduated plan for future CF training and education efforts:

- Course modules that introduce the concept of CA to personnel force-wide and are implemented early in one's career in order to foster a basic broad understanding of the concept of the CA to operations. Specifically, this early induction could educate CF personnel on (a) who the potential players are, (b) what their general role and contribution will likely be to the mission, and (c) how they will typically operate, whilst shedding light on the various organizational cultures. There are a variety of options for this type of training ranging from classic classroom modules taught by trained military personnel and/or members of OGDs to videos created to introduce personnel to CA and CA counterparts. The course material included in the Integrative Peacebuilding Program may be a good template for more advanced courseware that could be included in CA training.

- Interactive learning that is tailored to a mission and an individual's role within that mission. This could be achieved by first creating a series of missions within a computer program, such as VCAT or BiLat, that allows a person to practice the CA. These missions could be tailored to different types of missions and mission objectives and to various roles within the mission. This is a fairly low-cost solution in terms of finances, resources and time (all of which have been identified as impediments to training). While the initial development of the scenarios would have a financial cost, little future financial investment is required beyond occasional updates to scenarios. Because it could be available as self-paced training, this solution would not require an investment of personnel resources (i.e., instructors). This type of training could be done outside of the regular training schedule at one's own pace. Learning how to enable other CA counterparts to support their goals as well as the CF's goals in operations could be the potential performance outcome for this activity.

- Simulated operational scenarios that require negotiation with CA counterparts, such as NGOs and OGDs, and are facilitated by software such as Skype. This training has the advantage of being able to work with actual CA counterparts and allows personnel to apply the knowledge that they have developed in the previous steps in a somewhat realistic situation. One advantage of using a technology, such as Skype, is that trainees do not have to be co-located. Provided that trainees have access to a computer, they can participate from any location. Another advantage is that such training is a form of face-to-face training. Because the training is done with actual CA counterparts, this type of training also allows for the formation of relationships that may increase empathy, trust, and understanding across organizations. Performance outcomes include developing important competencies, such as communication skills, relationship building skills, and negotiation skills, as well as promoting a broader understanding of campaigns through the revelation of various perspectives in the interaction.

- The development of scenarios that could be included in the CF training exercises that creates a more realistic interaction between the CF and the CA counterparts. This should be developed with input from relevant CA counterparts and should incorporate an element of ambiguity or complexity surrounding the right course of action. Teaching trainees how to manage situations that involve conflict, thereby working on developing communication and relationship building skills, can be achieved by injecting situations where the counterpart's goals are incompatible with one's own goals. It should also incorporate a necessity to determine when and where the CA can and should be implemented. While this solution is the one with the greatest cost with regard to finances, resources, and time, it is the solution that has the most operational relevance and will likely have the greatest impact on actual

operations. Again, the performance outcomes include developing important competencies, such as communication skills, relationship building skills, and negotiation skills, as well as promoting a broader understanding of campaigns through the revelation of various perspectives in the interaction. CA counterpart inclusion in exercises also builds relationships and networks.

In accordance with the training needs facing the CF today, all of the preceding components of the suggested training and education plan must have CA counterpart input (most notably OGDs) in order to ensure the high fidelity of the training material as well as promote ongoing relationships with these CA actors. Each component must also include specific measureable performance outcomes in order to ensure that training is effective. In the end, this evolution of training and education allows one to move from the theoretical aspects of the CA to its real-world application, which has been emphasized as the desired end-state by all participants.

> *I think theory is important and is the basis to most things, but whatever training CF members have, it has to be hands on. It has to be something that they can adapt and use within their own life experience.*

This page intentionally left blank.

References

Department of State. (2013). *Integrated Assessment and Planning for Stability, Conflict Prevention and Response: Level 1*. Retrieved from https://crs.state.gov/Pages/Planning.aspx.

Holton, T., Febbraro, A., Filardo, E.-A., Barnes, M., Fraser, B., and Spiece, R. (2011). The relationship between non-governmental organizations and the Canadian Forces. In M. Rostek & P. Gizewski (Eds.), *Security operations in the 21st century: Canadian perspectives on the Comprehensive Approach,* pp. 215-226, Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Holton, T. L., Piasentin, K., Filardo, E.-A., Thompson, M., and Febbraro, A. (2012). Evaluation of Alelo's Operational Language and Culture Training System for use by the Canadian Forces. (U) (DRDC Toronto TM 2012-117) Defence R&D Canada – Toronto.

Pearson Centre. (2013). *Exercises and Simulations.* Retrieved from http://www.pearsoncentre.org/Exercises+and+Simulations

Thompson, M. M., Febbraro, A. R., and Holton, T. (2012). Interagency contact and training for a comprehensive approach to operations: Assessment of the Formation Operations Center of Excellence 'Civil-Military Seminar'. (U) (DRDC Toronto TM 2012-017) Defence R&D Canada – Toronto.

Thomson, M. H., Adams, B. D., Filardo, E.-A., Flear, C. R., and DeWit, Y. C. (2013). The psychological dynamics of civil-military collaboration. (U) (DRDC Toronto CR 2013-009) Defence R&D Canada – Toronto.

Thomson, M.H., Adams, B.D., Hall, C.D., Brown, A.B., Flear, C.R. (2011). *Collaboration between the Canadian Forces and the public in operations* (DRDC Toronto CR2011-073). Toronto, ON: Defence Research and Development Canada – Toronto.

Thomson, M.H., Adams, B.D., Hall, C.D. & Flear, C.R. (2010). Collaboration within the JIMP (Joint, Interagency, Multinational, Public) environment. (U) (DRDC Toronto CR2010-136). Toronto, ON: Defence Research and Development Canada – Toronto.

Thomson, M. H., Hall, C.D.T., and Adams, B.D. (2009). CF education and training for interagency operational contexts. (U) (DRDC Toronto CR 2010-013). Toronto, ON: Defence Research and Development Canada – Toronto.

This page intentionally left blank.

Annex A

A1. Consent Form for Subject Matter Expert Meetings

Title: Review of Comprehensive Approach Training Tools and Needs Assessment of Army User Community for Comprehensive Approach Needs.

Ethics Protocol Number: **2012-040**

Principal Investigator: Dr. Tara L. Holton, Defence R&D Canada - Toronto

Co-Investigators: Dr. Megan M. Thompson, Defence R&D Canada – Toronto; Dr. Angela R. Febbraro, Defence R&D Canada – Toronto; Dr. Ritu Gill, Defence R& D Canada – Toronto; Dr. Kelly Piasentin, Defence R&D Canada-Toronto; Michael Thomson, Human*systems* Inc., Dr. Barb Adams, Human*systems* Inc.

Thrust: 14co01/12tz06, (Applied Research Project in Command Thrust, PG4, PG2)

I _____ (name) hereby volunteer to participate in the study (Protocol #2012-040). I have read the Information Letter, and have had the opportunity to ask questions of the Investigators. All of my questions concerning this study have been fully answered to my satisfaction. However, I may obtain additional information about the research project and have any questions about this study answered by contacting Dr. Tara L. Holton at 416-635-2000 Extension 2101.

I have been told that I will be asked to participate in an interview lasting approximately 1 hour. I understand that the interview will be audio-recorded with my consent and that notes will be taken. I understand that if acceptable to me, two individuals may be interviewed at the same time to facilitate conversation.

I have been told that risks associated with this research are minimal as I will be asked about my everyday work and relevant CF training and education experiences. However, if asked questions that make me feel uncomfortable, I may decline to answer and I may terminate my participation at any time. Also, I acknowledge that my participation in this study, or indeed in any research, may involve risks that are currently unforeseen by DRDC.

I have been advised that all data I provide will be treated as strictly confidential, and will not be revealed to anyone other than the Investigators without my consent, except as data unidentified as to source. I also understand that the data concerning me may be used in future research projects by researchers in collaboration with the Investigators, and that the data will be treated as strictly confidential and reported as data unidentified as to source.

I have been told that I should not mention specific individuals or groups by name or provide enough details to identify individuals or groups, in the course of this interview, as protection to me in the unlikely event of an Access to Information request. I have also been told that my interview is covered by the Privacy Act, and that any information that may identify me personally cannot be released without my consent. I also understand that although a list of participants will be sent to the Canadian Army Personnel Research Coordinator/COS Land Ops, none of the data from the study will be attributed to the source.

I understand that I am free to refuse to participate and may withdraw my consent without prejudice or penalty at any time. Should I withdraw my consent, my participation as a participant will cease immediately. In this case I will have the option of requiring that any data that I have provided be destroyed. I also understand that the Investigator(s), or their designate, may terminate my participation at any time, regardless of my wishes.

Also, I understand that my name will not be identified or attached in any manner to any report or publication arising from this study.

For Civilian Participants:

Participant's name: _____

Signature:_____

Date: _____

For Canadian Forces (CF) members only: I understand that I am considered to be on duty for disciplinary, administrative and Pension Act purposes during my participation in this study.

Participant's name: _____

Signature:_____

Date: _____

FOR PARTICIPANT ENQUIRY IF REQUIRED:

Should I have any questions or concerns regarding this project before, during or after participation, I understand that I am encouraged to contact Defence Research and Development Canada - Toronto (DRDC Toronto), P.O. Box 2000, 1133 Sheppard Avenue West, Toronto, Ontario, M3K 2C9. This contact can be made by surface mail at this address or in person, by phone or e-mail to any of the DRDC Toronto members and addresses listed below:

- Principal Investigator: Tara L. Holton, DRDC Toronto, 416-635-2000, Extension 2101, Tara.Holton@drdc-rddc.gc.ca

- Chair, DRDC Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC): Dr. Don McCreary, 416-635-2120, HREC-CEESH-TORONTO@drdc-rddc.gc.ca

I understand that I will be given a copy of this consent form so that I may contact any of the above-mentioned individuals at some time in the future should that be required.

A2. Information Letter for Subject Matter Expert Meetings

Dear Participant:

You are being asked to participate in a study intended to review existing tools currently in use by the CF, our allies and industry for working within a "Comprehensive Approach" to operations. The purpose of the study, entitled "Training Toolkit for the Comprehensive Approach," is to assess a range of inter-cultural competency and collaboration training tools and methodologies in order to develop an integrated training toolkit for the Comprehensive Approach to operations.

To assist in this study, you are being asked for approximately 1 hour of your time to participate in an interview. Interviews may be conducted over the phone or in person, at your convenience. Interviews may be conducted with two interviewees at a time to facilitate conversation, if acceptable to all parties.

The information that you provide in the interview is strictly confidential and in order to ensure the confidentiality of yourself and others, we ask that you do not mention specific individuals or groups by name, or provide enough details to identify individuals or groups, in the course of this interview. This acts as protection to you in the unlikely event of an Access to Information request. Please also note that your interview is covered by the Privacy Act, and that any information that may identify you personally cannot be released without your consent. Please be advised that although a list of participants will be sent to the Canadian Army Personnel Research Coordinator/COS Land Ops, none of the data from the study will be attributed to the source.

With your consent, the interview will be recorded and notes will be taken. The recording and notes will be kept in a secure location accessible only to the researchers involved with this or ensuing/related projects. Interviews will be associated with a code number rather than a name to ensure confidentiality. At no time will the content of your interview be made available to anyone outside of the research team or subsequent research team(s). Any interview material used in the write up of reports or publications will have any and all identifying characteristics removed.

The risks associated with your participation in this study are minimal and are anticipated to be no greater than what you would encounter in your daily life or occupation. If, however, a topic of discussion makes you feel uncomfortable, you should feel free to decline to answer. Your participation in the study is completely voluntary and you may withdraw from the study at any time, without penalty.

If you are interested in participating in this study, please complete the attached Voluntary Consent Form, and return it to the researcher.

The Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) of Defence Research and Development Canada (DRDC) has approved this study "Review of Comprehensive Approach Training Tools and Needs Assessment of Army User Community for Comprehensive Approach Needs".

This research project has been coordinated through the DGMPRA Social Science Research Review Board, in accordance with CANFORGEN 198/08. Coordination# 1165/12-N. The opinions expressed in this document are those of the author and are not necessarily those of the Department of National Defence or the Canadian Forces.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact the Principal Investigator, Dr. Tara Holton, whose contact information is listed below. You may also contact the Chair of the HREC, Dr. Don McCreary, at HREC-CEESH-TORONTO@drdc-rddc.gc.ca or (416) 635-2120.

Sincerely,

Dr. Tara L. Holton   Tel: (416) 635-2000, Ext. 2101
DRDC Toronto   Fax: (416) 635-2191
1133 Sheppard Avenue West   E-mail:
P.O. Box 2000   Tara.Holton@drdc-rddc.gc.ca
Toronto, Ontario
M3K 2C9

A3. Subject Matter Expert Meeting Protocol

Comprehensive Approach Toolkit: Training Needs Analysis

Subject Matter Expert Meeting Protocol

The comprehensive approach is intended to ensure a "more coordinated" and "holistic" approach to operations, which "would employ diplomatic, defence, development, and commercial resources, aligned with those of numerous other agencies, coordinated through an integrated campaign plan, and then applied in areas of operations as needed" (Leslie, Gizewski, & Rostek, 2008). Many actors work to generate convergent effects.

Please consider the following questions from a tactical/operational perspective.

1. We're trying to get a sense of how members of the CF understand the comprehensive approach. In your own words, please describe what the comprehensive approach to operations means to you.

2. Is the comprehensive approach to operations different from past approaches?

3. Does the comprehensive approach to operations demand different education/training than what the CF has done in the past? If so, what training and education would a member of the CF need to have in terms of:
   - resources (funding, endorsement, facilities, expertise, tools)?
   - core skills/competencies?
   - personality characteristics?
   - other aspects?

4. Please describe the current education and training that prepares CF personnel for a comprehensive approach to operations.

5. Please describe ways in which training and education for the comprehensive approach could be integrated into other current CF training exercises or courses.

6. Please describe your experience with CA education/training. For example:
   - What did you learn and how (or) was that training useful for your deployments?
   - Has the education and training changed since the end of the war in Afghanistan? If yes, in what specific ways?

7. In your opinion, does training for the comprehensive approach need to be Force wide or is it only necessary for a particular group of CF personnel?

8. In terms of the evaluation of training/education for the comprehensive approach, besides After Action Reviews or Lessons Learned and the like, are there any best practices that you've come across, or that you can suggest might be useful?

9. Reflecting on current training/education related to the CA, what do you see are the critical gaps at present? In other words, how could CA training and education be improved?

10. Are there any other comments you'd like to make regarding training/education for the comprehensive approach?

11. Please take a moment to think about the training you've received in decision making and planning processes.
    - Do these processes apply to the comprehensive approach? Why or why not?
    - For Mil: Do they work with the planning and decision making processes used by other government/interagency partners? Why or why not?

- For OGDs/GPs: Do your planning and decision making processes work with the military's processes? Why or why not?

This page intentionally left blank.

Annex B

B1.   Consent Form for Focus Groups

Title: Review of Comprehensive Approach Training Tools and Needs Assessment of Army User Community for Comprehensive Approach Needs

Principal Investigator: Dr. Tara L. Holton, Defence R&D Canada - Toronto

Co-Investigators: Dr. Megan M. Thompson, Defence R&D Canada – Toronto; Dr. Angela R. Febbraro, Defence R&D Canada – Toronto; Dr. Ritu Gill, Defence R& D Canada – Toronto; Dr. Kelly Piasentin, Defence R&D Canada-Toronto; Michael Thomson, Human*systems* Inc., Dr. Barb Adams, Human*systems* Inc.

Thrust: 14co01/12tz06, (Applied Research Project in Command Thrust, PG4, PG2)

I _____ (name) of _____ (address and phone number) hereby volunteer to participate as a participant in the study (Protocol #). I have read the Information Letter, and have had the opportunity to ask questions of the Investigators. All of my questions concerning this study have been fully answered to my satisfaction. However, I may obtain additional information about the research project and have any questions about this study answered by contacting Dr. Tara L. Holton at 416-635-2000 Extension 2101.

I have been told that I will be asked to participate in an interview lasting approximately 1 hour. I understand that the interview will be audio-recorded with my consent and that notes will be taken.

I have been told that risks associated with this research are minimal as I will be asked about my everyday work and relevant CF training and education experiences. However, if asked questions that make me feel uncomfortable, I may decline to answer and I may terminate my participation at any time. Also, I acknowledge that my participation in this study, or indeed in any research, may involve risks that are currently unforeseen by DRDC.

I have been advised that all data I provide will be treated as strictly confidential, and will not be revealed to anyone other than the Investigators without my consent, except as data unidentified as to source. I also understand that the data concerning me may be used in future research projects by researchers in collaboration with the Investigators, and that the data will be treated as strictly confidential and reported as data unidentified as to source.

I have been told that I should not mention specific individuals or groups by name or provide enough details to identify individuals or groups, in the course of this interview, as protection to me in the unlikely event of an Access to Information request. I have also been told that my interview is covered by the Privacy Act, and that any information that may identify me personally cannot be released without my consent.

I understand that I am free to refuse to participate and may withdraw my consent without prejudice or penalty at any time. Should I withdraw my consent, my participation as a participant will cease immediately. In this case I will have the option of requiring that any data that I have provided be destroyed. I also understand that the Investigator(s), or their designate, may terminate my participation at any time, regardless of my wishes.

Also, I understand that my name will not be identified or attached in any manner to any report or publication arising from this study.

For Civilian Participants:
Participant's name: _____

Signature:_____

Date: _____

Name of Witness to Signature: _____

Signature: _____

Date:_____

For Canadian Forces (CF) members only: I understand that I am considered to be on duty for disciplinary, administrative and Pension Act purposes during my participation in this study.
Participant's name: _____

Signature:_____

Date: _____

Name of Witness to Signature: _____

Signature: _____

Date:_____

FOR PARTICIPANT ENQUIRY IF REQUIRED:

Should I have any questions or concerns regarding this project before, during or after participation, I understand that I am encouraged to contact Defence Research and Development Canada - Toronto (DRDC Toronto), P.O. Box 2000, 1133 Sheppard Avenue West, Toronto, Ontario, M3K 2C9. This contact can be made by surface mail at this address or in person, by phone or e-mail to any of the DRDC Toronto members and addresses listed below:

- Principal Investigator: Tara L. Holton, DRDC Toronto, 416-635-2000, Extension 2101, Tara.Holton@drdc-rddc.gc.ca

- Chair, DRDC Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC): Dr. Don McCreary, 416-635-2120, don.mccreary@drdc-rddc.gc.ca

I understand that I will be given a copy of this consent form so that I may contact any of the above-mentioned individuals at some time in the future should that be required.

B2. Information Letter for Focus Groups

Dear Participant:

You are being asked to participate in a needs assessment of the Army user community for present and anticipated needs regarding the "Comprehensive Approach" to operations. The purpose of the study, entitled "Training Toolkit for the Comprehensive Approach," is to assess a range of inter-cultural competency and collaboration training tools and methodologies in order to develop an integrated training toolkit for the Comprehensive Approach to operations.

To assist in this study, you are being asked for approximately two hours of your time to participate in a focus group. Focus groups will consist of 6-10 individuals.

The information that you provide in the focus group is strictly confidential and in order to ensure the confidentiality of yourself and others, we ask that you do not mention specific individuals or groups by name, or provide enough details to identify individuals or groups, in the course of this focus group interview. This acts as protection to you in the unlikely event of an Access to Information request. Please also note that your interview is covered by the Privacy Act, and that any information that may identify you personally cannot be released without your consent.

With your consent, the focus group will be recorded and notes will be taken. The recording and notes will be kept in a secure location accessible only to the researchers involved with this or ensuing/related projects. Focus groups will be associated with a code number rather than indicating participant names to ensure confidentiality. At no time will the content of the focus group discussion be made available to anyone outside of the research team. The same consideration will apply should you grant permission for the secondary use of data, and again at no time will the content of the focus group discussion be made available to anyone outside of the subsequent team(s). Any interview material used in the write up of the final report or subsequent publications will have any and all identifying characteristics removed.

The risks associated with your participation in this study are minimal and are anticipated to be no greater than what you would encounter in your daily life or occupation. If, however, a topic of discussion makes you feel uncomfortable, you should feel free to decline to answer. Your participation in the study is completely voluntary and you may withdraw from the study at any time, without penalty.

If you are interested in participating in this study, please complete the attached Voluntary Consent Form, and return it to the researcher.

The Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) of Defence Research and Development Canada (DRDC) has approved this study "Review of Comprehensive Approach Training Tools and Needs Assessment of Army User Community for Comprehensive Approach Needs".

This research project has been coordinated through the DGMPRA Social Science Research Review Board, in accordance with CANFORGEN 198/08. Coordination# 1165/12-N. The opinions expressed in this document are those of the author and are not necessarily those of the Department of National Defence or the Canadian Forces.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact the Principal Investigator, Dr. Tara Holton, whose contact information is listed below. You may also contact the chair of the HREC, Dr. Don McCreary, at don.mccreary@drdc-rddc.gc.ca or (416) 635-2120.

Sincerely,

Dr. Tara L. Holton   Tel: (416) 635-2000, Ext. 2101
DRDC Toronto   Fax: (416) 635-2191
1133 Sheppard Avenue West   E-mail:
P.O. Box 2000   Tara.Holton@drdc-rddc.gc.ca
Toronto, Ontario
M3K 2C9

B3. Training Needs Analysis – Focus Group Protocol

I. Introduction

Overall ARP; what steps (interviews) – informing the focus group – DRDC/HSI®

II. Demographic Questions

1. Please indicate your gender.
2. Please indicate your age.
3. Please indicate your operational environment.
4. Please indicate your rank.
5. Please indicate the number of domestic deployments of which you have been a part.
6. Please indicate the number of international combat missions of which you have been a part.
7. Please indicate the number of international peace support operations of which you have been a part.
8. Please indicate the number of humanitarian missions of which you have been a part.

III. Definition of Comprehensive Approach

The comprehensive approach (CA) to operations has been described as the "ability to bring to bear all instruments of national and coalition power and influence upon a problem in a timely, coordinated fashion (i.e., diplomatic, economic, military, and informational)" (Leslie et al., 2008, p. 11). And consequently, a force that adopts the CA "would employ diplomatic, defence, development, and commercial resources, aligned with those of numerous other agencies, coordinated through an integrated campaign plan, and then applied in areas of operations as needed", producing ultimately "greater mission effectiveness" (Leslie et al., 2008, p. 11).

IV. Comprehensive Approach Counterparts

1) Of these potential counterparts below, please rank in order who you'll likely work with most closely/often in the CA:

   a) OGDs
   b) NGOs
   c) IOs (specifically the UN)
   d) Other NATO militaries
   e) Local governments in-theatre
   f) Local populations in-theatre
   g) Other

---

2) Of the OGDs, which do you work most closely with in the CA?

   a) CIDA
   b) DFAIT
   c) RCMP
   d) CSC
   e) Other

3) Does the type of training that is most useful depend on the partner that you most often worked with in an operational setting?

V. Comprehensive Approach Counterparts

4) How important do you believe the Comprehensive Approach is to the success of future CF operations?

5) How well does Canada currently implement the CA to operations compared to other nations, such as the UK, the US, Australia?

6) How transferrable are the CA methods used in Afghanistan to future operational environments?

7) How important is it that CA training is on-going rather than just part of pre-deployment training?

VI. Support for Comprehensive Approach Training

8) How supportive are the senior levels of the CA training that currently exists?

9) How important is senior level endorsement for the advancement of training for the CA?

10) How important is it to start CA training early in one's CF career?

11) To what extent does CA training currently exist for junior level officers through the various CF institutions and training facilities?

12) How important is it that all CF leaders get training for CA operations?

13) To what extent is the CA integrated in current doctrine?

14) Does the CA need to be integrated into CF doctrine?

15) Do we need to have separate or stand-alone CA doctrine (i.e., a doctrinal document specifically devoted to CA)?

VII.   Competencies of Comprehensive Approach operators

16) Please rank in order of importance the following characteristics for military personnel to operate effectively in the CA environment:
    a) Flexibility/Adaptability (both behavioural and cognitive)
    b) Inventiveness/Imagination/Creativity
    c) Negotiation skills
    d) Communication skills
    e) Interpersonal skills/Relationship building
    f) Problem Solving/Critical Thinking
    g) Self/Emotional Regulation
    h) Self-Confidence (or Self-Efficacy)
    i) Cultural Empathy
    j) Open-mindedness/ Tolerance for Ambiguity

17) How well is ___ (insert characteristic) being trained today in the CF training system, specifically for CA operations?

18) How well is___ (insert characteristic) being trained today in the CF training system, specifically for CA operations?

19) How well is___ (insert characteristic) being trained today in the CF training system, specifically for CA operations?

20) Does the CF select personnel for CA operations?

21) Should the CF select personnel for CA operations?

22) How well does the CF select personnel for CA operations?

VIII.   Features of Comprehensive Approach Tools

23) In your experience, how well has the civilian perspective been integrated into training exercises?

24) Please rank these tools from the most useful to the least useful for CA training:
    a) Classroom training module
    b) Frequently updated videos
    c) Training exercises that incorporate members of OGDs
    d) Training exercises that use trained actors to represent members of OGDs
    e) Guest lectures from CA partners
    f) Interactive computer programs
    g) Skype facilitated operational scenario exercises with CA counterpart
    h) CIV-MIL Seminars
    i) Secondments to OGDs
    j) One or two day awareness visits to OGDs

25) Classroom training module:

    a) Considering the tools you just ranked, please indicate how often they occur: Classroom training module.

    b) Considering the tools you just ranked, please indicate how probable their occurrence would be: Classroom training module

26) Frequently updated videos

    a)   Considering the tools you just ranked, please indicate how often they occur: Frequently updated videos

    b)   Considering the tools you just ranked, please indicate how probable their occurrence would be: Frequently updated videos

27) Training exercises that incorporate members of OGDs

    a)   Considering the tools you just ranked, please indicate how often they occur: Training exercises that incorporate members of OGDs

    b)   Considering the tools you just ranked, please indicate how probable their occurrence would be: Training exercises that incorporate members of OGD

28) Training exercises that use trained actors to represent member of OGDs

    a)   Considering the tools you just ranked, please indicate how often they occur: Training exercises that use trained actors to represent members of OGDs

    b)   Considering the tools you just ranked, please indicate how probable their occurrence would be: Training exercises that use trained actors to represent members of OGDs

29) Guest lectures from CA counterparts

    a)   Considering the tools you just ranked, please indicate how often they occur: Guest lectures from CA counterparts

    b)   Considering the tools you just ranked, please indicate how probable their occurrence would be: Guest lectures from CA counterparts

30) Interactive computer programs

    a)   Considering the tools you just ranked, please indicate how often they occur: Interactive computer programs

    b)   Considering the tools you just ranked, please indicate how probable their occurrence would be: Interactive computer programs

31) Skype facilitated operational scenario exercises with CA counterparts

    a)   Considering the tools you just ranked, please indicate how often they occur: Skype facilitated operational scenario exercises with CA counterparts

    b)   Considering the tools you just ranked, please indicate how probable their occurrence would be: Skype facilitated operational scenario exercises with CA counterparts

32) CIV-MIL seminars

    a)   Considering the tools you just ranked, please indicate how often they occur: CIV-MIL seminars

    b)   Considering the tools you just ranked, please indicate how probable their occurrence would be: CIV-MIL seminars

33) Secondments to OGDs

  a) Considering the tools you just ranked, please indicate how often they occur: Secondments to OGDs

  b) Considering the tools you just ranked, please indicate how probable their occurrence would be: Secondments to OGDs

34) One or two day awareness visits to OGDs

  a) Considering the tools you just ranked, please indicate how often they occur: One or two day awareness visits to OGDs

  b) Considering the tools you just ranked, please indicate how probable their occurrence would be: One or two day awareness visits to OGDs

35) When developing future tools that would be useful for training the CA, how important is it that they are available to all CF personnel?

36) When developing future tools that would be useful for training the CA, how important is it that they are cost effective?

37) When developing future tools that would be useful for training the CA, how important is it that they fit within current CF training time constraints?

38) When developing future tools that would be useful for training the CA, how important is it that they are directly trained rather than self-paced?

39) When developing future tools that would be useful for training the CA, how important is it that the training be conducted by military personnel rather than civilians?

40) When developing future tools that would be useful for training the CA, how important is it that it is created specifically for military personnel rather than CA counterparts?

IX.   Evaluation of Existing Comprehensive Approach Tools

41) Tool: Operational Language and Culture Training System

  a) Have you ever seen this tool before?

  b) Have you ever used this tool before?

  c) How useful do you think this tool would be for CA training?

  d) Do you think this tool could be tailored for training to work with OGDs rather than host nations?

42) Tool: Virtual Cultural Awareness Trainer

  a) Have you ever seen this tool before?

  b) Have you ever used this tool before?

  c) How useful do you think this tool would be for CA training?

  d) Do you think this tool could be tailored for training to work with OGDs rather than host nations?

43) Tool: Headstart2

   a) Have you ever seen this tool before?

   b) Have you ever used this tool before?

   c) How useful do you think this tool would be for CA training?

   d) Do you think this tool could be tailored for training to work with OGDs rather than host nations?

44) Tool: Countries in Perspective and Cultural Orientations

   a) Have you ever seen this tool before?

   b) Have you ever used this tool before?

   c) How useful do you think this tool would be for CA training?

   d) Do you think this tool could be tailored for training to work with OGDs rather than host nations?

45) Tool: Smart Cards

   a) Have you ever seen this tool before?

   b) Have you ever used this tool before?

   c) How useful do you think this tool would be for CA training?

   d) Do you think this tool could be tailored for training to work with OGDs rather than host nations?

46) Tool: eCrossCulture

   a) Have you ever seen this tool before?

   b) Have you ever used this tool before?

   c) How useful do you think this tool would be for CA training?

   d) Do you think this tool could be tailored for training to work with OGDs rather than host nations?

47) Tool: Global MedAid App

   a) Have you ever seen this tool before?

   b) Have you ever used this tool before?

   c) How useful do you think this tool would be for CA training?

   d) Do you think this tool could be tailored for training to work with OGDs rather than host nations?

48) Tool: Tools for Operational Planning Functional Area Service

   a) Have you ever seen this tool before?

   b) Have you ever used this tool before?

   c) How useful do you think this tool would be for CA training?

   d) Do you think this tool could be tailored for training to work with OGDs rather than host nations?

49) Tool: Simulated Operations via Skype

   a) Have you ever seen this tool before?

   b) Have you ever used this tool before?

   c) How useful do you think this tool would be for CA training?

   d) Do you think this tool could be tailored for training to work with OGDs rather than host nations?

50) Please rank the tools you have just reviewed with regard to their usefulness for the CA:
   a) Operational Language and Culture Training System
   b) Virtual Cultural Awareness Trainer
   c) Headstart2
   d) Countries in Perspective and Cultural Orientations
   e) Smart Cards
   f) Rosetta Stone
   g) UN Integrated Mission Planning Process
   h) eCrossCulture
   i) Global MedAid
   j) TOPFAS

51) Is there a good example of a comparable successful effort to train a new skill or area that should be used as a guide for how to best promote CA training?

52) Is it more feasible that the CF create its own tool or set of tools, or find an existing tool from other countries or agencies?

    X.   Impediments to Comprehensive Approach Training

53) Please rank which of the following issues are likely impediments to training for the CA.
     a. Lack of financial resources
     b. Lack of buy-in from senior leadership
     c. Lack of OGD input into course material
     d. Lack of personnel from OGDs to participate in training
     e. Lack of interest across the CF
     f. Other

XI.   Planning Process

1. How effective for the CA are the decision making and planning processes you've been trained on?

2. How well do these planning and decision making processes you've been trained on integrate with those used by other government/interagency counterparts?

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA		
(Security classification of the title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall document is classified)		
1. ORIGINATOR (The name and address of the organization preparing the document, Organizations for whom the document was prepared, e.g. Centre sponsoring a contractor's document, or tasking agency, are entered in section 8.) Publishing: DRDC Toronto 1133 Sheppard Ave W. Toronto, Ontario. M3K 2C9 Performing: HumanSystems Inc. 111 Farquhar Street, Guelph, ON N1H 3N4 Monitoring: Contracting: DRDC Toronto 1133 Sheppard Ave W. Toronto, Ontario, M3K 2C9		2. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION (Overall security classification of the document including special warning terms if applicable.) UNCLASSIFIED (NON-CONTROLLED GOODS) DMC A REVIEW: GCEC April 2011
3. TITLE (The complete document title as indicated on the title page. Its classification is indicated by the appropriate abbreviation (S, C, R, or U) in parenthesis at the end of the title) Comprehensive Approach Training Toolkit: Training Needs Analysis (U) (U)		
4. AUTHORS (First name, middle initial and last name. If military, show rank, e.g. Maj. John E. Doe.) Emily-Ana Filardo, Michael H. Thomson, Alisha Harkness, Barbara D. Adams		
5. DATE OF PUBLICATION (Month and year of publication of document.) July 2013	6a NO. OF PAGES (Total containing information, including Annexes, Appendices, etc.) 124	6b. NO. OF REFS (Total cited in document.) 9
7. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (The category of the document, e.g. technical report, technical note or memorandum. If appropriate, enter the type of document, e.g. interim, progress, summary, annual or final. Give the inclusive dates when a specific reporting period is covered.) Contract Report Scientific Authority: Tara Holton		
8. SPONSORING ACTIVITY (The names of the department project office or laboratory sponsoring the research and development - include address.) Sponsoring: Tasking:		
9a. PROJECT OR GRANT NO. (If appropriate, the applicable research and development project or grant under which the document was written. Please specify whether project or grant.) Project numbers: ST1402TZ0600 and 04ge03-1		9b. CONTRACT NO. (If appropriate, the applicable number under which the document was written.) W7711-098158/001/TOR
10a. ORIGINATOR'S DOCUMENT NUMBER (The official document number by which the document is identified by the originating activity. This number must be unique to this document) DRDC Toronto CR 2013-111		10b. OTHER DOCUMENT NO(s). (Any other numbers under which may be assigned this document either by the originator or by the sponsor.) Call up number: 8158-10
11. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY (Any limitations on the dissemination of the document, other than those imposed by security classification.) Unlimited distribution		
12. DOCUMENT ANNOUNCEMENT (Any limitation to the bibliographic announcement of this document. This will normally correspond to the Document Availability (11), However, when further distribution (beyond the audience specified in (11) is possible, a wider announcement audience may be selected.)) Unlimited announcement		

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA

(Security classification of the title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall document is classified)

13. ABSTRACT (A brief and factual summary of the document. It may also appear elsewhere in the body of the document itself. It is highly desirable that the abstract of classified documents be unclassified. Each paragraph of the abstract shall begin with an indication of the security classification of the information in the paragraph (unless the document itself is unclassified) represented as (S), (C), (R), or (U). It is not necessary to include here abstracts in both official languages unless the text is bilingual.)

This research was conducted in support of a Defence Research and Development Canada -Toronto (DRDC Toronto) applied research project (ARP) aimed at developing a Canadian Forces (CF) training toolkit for personnel deploying to operations that adopt the Comprehensive Approach (CA). The CA to operations has been described as the fiabilit to bring to bear all instruments of national and coalition power and influence upon a problem in a timely, coordinated fashion (i.e., diplomatic, economic, military, and informational)fl (Leslie, Gizewski, & Rostek, 2009, p. 11). This means that effectiv utilization of the CA requires collaboration between civilian and military assets. However, due to organizational differences in goals, culture, motivation, and so on, this collaboration has been challenging in the past (e.g., Holton, Febbraro, Filardo, Barnes, Fraser, & Spiece, 2011; Thomson, Adams, Filardo, Flear, & DeWit, 2013; Thomson, Adams, Hall, Brown, & Flear, 2011). This suggests that effective CF engagement using the CA may require additional training and resources.

The current study was aimed at assessing the current state of CF training and education for the CA, identifying the needs and gaps, in an effort to develop a CA training toolkit. To (U) this end, a survey was conducted of existing tools available, amongst our allies and within the commercial environment, to train the CA within the CF. Discussions were conducted with subject-matter experts (SMEs) that identified issues to be considered in developing the toolkit, and focus-group discussions helped clarify the issues and suggested elements to include when training the CA. Results showed that a) there is a need to better understand CA counterparts, especially other government departments (OGDs); b) training needs to involve CA counterparts to increase its theoretical and operational relevance; c) there is a greater need for relationship building with CA counterparts through face-to-face interactions; d) CA training should include communication and relationship building skill development; e) CA training should include more extensive cultural awareness training that also encompasses organizational culture awareness; f) training needs to consider the type of operation, the goals of the mission, and a person™s role within a mission; and g) training needs to be cost-effective and must fit into the current training curriculum as training schedules are currently overloaded. Based on the SME and focus group discussions, recommendations are made for elements that might be included in the CA toolkit in a graduated plan for training and education.

(U) La présente recherche a été réalisée en soutien à un projet de recherche appliquée (PRA) de Recherche et développement pour la défense Canada Œ Toronto visant à élaborer une boîte à outils des Forces canadiennes à l™intention du personnel déployé à des opérations qui adoptent l™approche exhaustive (AE). Dans le cadre des opérations, cette approche a été décrite comme la « capacité d™exploiter toutes les sources de puissance et d™influence (diplomatiques, économiques, militaires, informationnelles, etc.) nationales et coalisées pour régler un problème d™une manière efficace et coordonnée » (Leslie, Gizewski, & Rostek, 2009, p. 11). Cela signifie que le recours efficace à l™AE repose sur la collaboration entre les ressources civiles et militaires. Cependant, en raison des différences organisationnelles en matière d™objectifs, de culture, de motivation, etc., cette collaboration a été ébranlée par le passé (p. ex. Holton, Febbraro, Filardo, Barnes, Fraser, & Spiece, 2011; Thomson, Adams, Filardo, Flear, & DeWit, 2013; Thomson, Adams, Hall, Brown, & Flear, 2011). Cela suggère que l™engagement efficace des FC dans l™utilisation de l™AE peut nécessiter de la formation et des ressources supplémentaires.

La présente étude visait à évaluer l™état actuel de la formation et de l™entraînement des

FC pour l'AE, à déterminer les besoins et les lacunes, afin d'élaborer une boîte à outils en matière d'AE. À cette fin, une étude des outils existants disponibles a été réalisée chez nos alliés et dans le milieu commercial, pour enseigner l'AE au sein des FC. Des discussions se sont déroulées auprès d'experts en la matière (EM) qui ont cerné des difficultés dont il faut tenir compte dans l'élaboration de la boîte à outils, et des discussions avec des groupes témoins ont aidé à clarifier les enjeux et permis de suggérer des éléments à inclure au moment de la formation en matière d'AE. Les résultats ont montré a)qu'il importe de mieux comprendre les homologues de l'AE, en particulier les autres ministères; b) les besoins en matière de formation pour impliquer les homologues en matière d'AE dans le but d'augmenter sa pertinence théorique et opérationnelle; c) qu'il faut absolument construire une relation avec les homologues en matière d'AE par des interactions en personne; d) que la formation en matière d'AE devrait comprendre le perfectionnement des compétences en communication et en construction de relations; e) qu'elle devrait aussi comprendre une formation plus intensive sur la sensibilisation à la culture qui comprend aussi la sensibilisation à la culture organisationnelle; f) que la formation doit tenir compte du type d'opération, des objectifs de la mission, et du rôle de la personne au sein d'une mission, et g) que la formation doit être rentable et s'inscrire dans le programme de formation actuel étant donné que les horaires de formation débordent déjà. D'après les discussions avec les EM et les groupes témoins, on a recommandé d'inclure des éléments dans la boîte à outils de l'AE selon un plan gradué de formation et d'instruction.

14. KEYWORDS, DESCRIPTORS or IDENTIFIERS (Technically meaningful terms or short phrases that characterize a document and could be helpful in cataloguing the document. They should be selected so that no security classification is required. Identifiers, such as equipment model designation, trade name, military project code name, geographic location may also be included. If possible keywords should be selected from a published thesaurus, e.g. Thesaurus of Engineering and Scientific Terms (TEST) and that thesaurus identified. If it is not possible to select indexing terms which are Unclassified, the classification of each should be indicated as with the title.)

(U) Comprehensive Approach, Training and Education, Other Government Departments, Interagency, JIMP, Canadian Forces

UNCLASSIFIED